MORAL TRAINING IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Class LC366
Book .M6
Copyright No.

COPYRIGHT DEPOSIT.

MORAL TRAINING IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS

THE CALIFORNIA PRIZE ESSAYS

BY

CHARLES EDWARD RUGH · T. P. STEVENSON
EDWIN DILLER STARBUCK · FRANK CRAMER · GEORGE E. MYERS

GINN & COMPANY
BOSTON · NEW YORK · CHICAGO · LONDON

LIBRARY of CONGRESS
Two Copies Received
AUG 27 1907
Copyright Entry
Apr 26 1907
CLASS A XXc., No.
175154
COPY B.

Copyright, 1907
By GINN & COMPANY

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

7.8

The Athenæum Press
GINN & COMPANY · PROPRIETORS · BOSTON · U.S.A.

PREFACE

A citizen of California, who modestly withholds his name, recently offered a prize of five hundred dollars for the best essay on "Moral Training in the Public Schools," and a second prize of three hundred dollars for the next best essay.

This offer was widely published in the educational, the religious, and the daily papers of the country, and over three hundred essays, many of them of high merit, were submitted.

The donor of the prize fund named as judges Rev. Charles R. Brown of Oakland, California, Dr. David Starr Jordan, President of Stanford University, and Professor Fletcher B. Dresslar of the Department of Education in the University of California.

The first prize was awarded to Mr. Charles Edward Rugh, Principal of the Bay School, Oakland, California, the second prize to Rev. T. P. Stevenson of Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

The three essays which stood next in rank according to the estimate of the committee, — submitted by Professor Edwin Diller Starbuck of the University of Iowa, Frank Cramer of Palo Alto, California, and Principal George E. Myers of the McKinley Manual Training School, Washington, D.C., — were possessed of so much value, and made such important contributions to the discussion of this vital

problem, that it seemed desirable to secure them for publication in the same volume which contained the two prize essays. Arrangements have accordingly been made with the writers so that the three other essays are here presented, the five essays constituting a useful volume for all who feel an interest in the moral output of our public-school system.

It is hoped that this book may be read not only by those directly engaged in educational work but by parents, citizens, clergymen, and others who recognize the seriousness of the problems here discussed.

The clear, popular style in which the essays are written, and the able manner in which the varied solutions are offered, make the volume most readable and profitable.

Committee of Judges
CHARLES R. BROWN
DAVID STARR JORDAN
FLETCHER B. DRESSLAR

CONTENTS

	Page
I. Charles Edward Rugh	3
II. T. P. Stevenson	53
III. Edwin Diller Starbuck	89
IV. Frank Cramer	122
V. George E. Myers	163

MORAL TRAINING IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS

I

THE doctrine of evolution has given us a new mental framework on which to construct our view of life and the world. According to this view the form and content of life is determined by the responses which the organism makes to its environment. Human organisms and environments have developed to such a state of complexity that it is impossible to respond to all the forms of stimulation and suggestion. Choice is possible and necessary. Intelligent moral choice is the method by which a conscious being preserves its life and integrity. This method of life requires standards and means for measuring the values of things, situations, reactions, and ideals.

Evolution describes the method of development of both individuals and institutions as "successive differentiation and integration." The division of labor, the separation of church and state, and the consequent changes thus brought about in the standards of values have thrust upon us new and grave problems of social integrations. The discovery of America, the Copernican theory, and the inventions and discoveries of science under the inspiration and guidance of the doctrine of evolution have transferred men's thought and interest from the supernatural to the natural. The king, the Bible, and the pope have been representatives of the supernatural order and have ruled by divine right. Under this new natural order the Bible, the church, and the state get their sanction and authority from their

service rather than from a power supposed to lie without them. The Bible is examined by the canons of literary, philosophic, and scientific criticism, and must stand the experimental test of trial. The clergy must appeal to man's sense of his place in the moral order. The laws of the democratic state derive their authority from the consent of the governed. The division of labor and the modern reorganization of industries have socially separated the employer from the employee, the producer from the consumer, the workman and workwoman from the home; therefore intimate personal association in these common interests of life is no more possible. The result is a divided responsibility and a "stratified conscience." Many a business man has one conscience or moral ideal for his home and church, another for his club, and quite another for the "company and its business." Historically "the church was the mother of schools." By support and control the state is now the father. Both demand the moral training of the child. Their separation has raised the question of the ways and means of moral training. The church stoutly maintains that there is no sound morality without religious sanction, and that the Bible is the safest text for the rules of faith and practice. Material progress and the spirit of democracy have raised the state into the place of supreme power. In the name of liberty our democratic state has excluded sectarian instruction from the public schools, and has prescribed courses of study made up of the so-called "secular" branches. This new order has not produced moral progress commensurate with the intellectual achievement and the advancement in technical skill. The decreasing percentage of illiteracy, the

increase of literature, and the marvelous achievements in science are unmistakable evidences of intellectual progress. The applications of science to the arts of life and the corresponding output of the machines of industry are positive proofs of progress in mechanical skill. The boldest optimist is disappointed when he looks for the correlative signs of moral growth. Indeed, criminologists, and even some publicists, are pointing to signs of moral decline in each of the historic institutions. The increasing number of divorces, the increasing number of dependent children, along with the increasing club life of men and women, are cited as examples of the decline of the moral sense of responsibility for the home. The alarming increase in the number of suicides and murders indicates a decline in the safety of human life and in the feeling of its sacredness. The increase of robbery and commitments for crime against property reveals either a pressing poverty or a growing greed. The increased expenditure for intoxicating beverages, and for tobacco, coffee, and candy, indicates the growing power of desire for mere stimulation of the nervous system. The methods of the Standard Oil and the insurance companies suggest that large corporations have no thought for the rights of the individual. Not a few men admit, and some boldly declare, that it is impossible to be honest and succeed in business. They say that there is no place in business for the Golden Rule. Many good people look with sorrow, shame, and fear upon the lack of civic honesty in municipal and national politics. The press declares and the pulpit admits that the church, the bulwark of morality, has declined in its power over the conduct and lives of men. Concerning morality in the public schools,

Dr. Harris, former United States Commissioner of Education, says: "There is no topic concerning which the suggestions made are more idle and unprofitable."

These social changes have had more effect upon the life of the child than upon any other member of society. Under the old order the children coöperated with the parents in producing and consuming the necessities of life. This stress and strain of common necessity provided the natural and social atmosphere for the development of the sense of individual and joint ownership, and the sense of moral values. The children had their share in the social events of home, society, and church. The older members of society provided the examples for imitation and the occasions for emulation in industry, society, and morals. Under the new order, gradation, separation, even isolation, has taken the place of coöperation. The child is removed from first-hand contact with Mother Nature. He gets his berries from a basket instead of from a bush, and his milk from a can instead of from a cow. The child is removed from first-hand contact with the productive industries. The factories and corporations have broken up the old-time home. Things used in the home are now made behind doors marked "Positively no admittance." The child is excluded from the social events of the club and often from those of the home. In school and church the child is "graded," that is, set apart on the basis of age, size, and appearance. Each child of a family may be in a different room, under a different teacher, and with different playmates. His social copies are of his own age and class. He takes his moral standards from his compeers. The machines of industry and the labor organizations have limited the number of apprentices.

In many cases the father is prohibited from taking his own son as an apprentice. All this has resulted in an enforced idleness of boys and girls outside of school hours. In the school hours the subjects and methods suggest the professions more than the trades. The schools emphasize scholarship rather than work and service. Knowledge of subject-matter is rapidly increasing; the opportunities for immediate application of this knowledge to useful labor are decreasing. This cramming of the mind with verbal, formal material, without putting it constantly to the test of trial, results in a kind of mental dry rot, which shows itself in intellectual and moral confusion, and inefficiency in life situations. The old social bonds are dissolving. The child is thrown into a very maelstrom of new and conflicting sights, sounds, situations, and temptations without adequate preparation to meet them. New methods of advertising and distributing goods afford many more occasions for lying and stealing than did the old home and farm.

"New occasions teach new duties." These radical changes in the social order, so greatly affecting the child, demand a correlation and integration of the moral forces, and a reorganization of the school upon a more social, and hence consciously ethical, basis. The school must take on more and more the form of the workshop and more and more the form of a social center.

This problem of moral training cannot be thrust back upon the home and church. They must do their part; but the whole child plays, learns, and lives, at home and away from home; and the whole child comes to school. The teacher must grasp the whole situation in order to do her part. She may have only a working hypothesis as to what

to do; but she must work her hypothesis for its full worth. This is the only method of testing it. Those who believe in formal moral training, those who believe in incidental moral training, those who believe in religious training, all may go on giving reasons for their belief; but the time has come when all must show their faith by works and results.

Means and methods of moral training. The churches hold to the religious sanctions for morality, and demand the use of the Bible in education. They have prepared the three plans which follow:

1. Let churches agree upon a common creed concerning God, duty, and immortality, and found moral training upon such a creed.

2. Separate the pupils into classes according to sectarian affiliations, and turn them over to their own clergymen or teachers. The high authority of Germany is quoted in support of this plan.

3. Let each sect build its own schools and draw upon public funds in proportion to the number of children under instruction.

These sectarian plans are inconsistent with the spirit of modern democracy.

The school of the Society of Ethical Culture of New York City has undertaken to exemplify unsectarian moral instruction. Felix Adler, the leader, expresses the theory of this solution as follows: "It is the business of the moral instructor in the public school to deliver to his pupil [note the mechanical view of the child still present] the subject-matter of morality, but not to deal with the sanctions of it; to give to his pupils a clear understanding of what *is* right and what *is* wrong, but not to enter into the question

why the right should be done and the wrong avoided. . . . The conscience can be enlightened, strengthened, guided, and all this can be done without once raising the question why it is wrong to do what is forbidden."

Mr. Adler has collected and carefully graded a number of fairy tales, stories, and maxims, as material for moral training. This simplifies the whole problem by omitting the sanctions or reasons for conduct. This solution is correct and safe for boys or girls who cannot or do not ask "Why?" But most American boys and girls do ask "Why?" and a refusal to satisfy this craving of the rational soul raises the suspicion whether there be good reasons for doing what is required.

The present is pregnant with promise. Those who object to the use of the Bible and religious instruction in public schools have just the situation they desire, and the burden is upon them to provide other means of moral training and to prove their adequacy.

The believers in the Bible and the Christian religion of course accept their central doctrines: (1) the Kingdom of Heaven is within the children of the kingdom, and (2) that the personal life is the most efficient means of propagating this kingdom. Excluding the Bible and religious instruction from the schools does not exclude them from the life of the teacher. Next to the inherent seeds of morality and religion in each child, the character of the teacher is the most important factor in moral training in the school. It is significant that the two greatest moral teachers of the ages, Socrates and Jesus, left no formal book of instruction, but relied upon their lives and the effect of their lives upon their disciples, as the means of propagating their teaching.

Constitutions and legislatures have no objection to this living morality.

For the present, constitutional limitations and state laws have determined the practice of the teacher in regard to the formal presentation of the Bible and religious instruction in many public schools. The Hebrew race and the Bible have been the two mightiest forces in the moral uplift of mankind, and until the teacher is as free to use the inspiring and instructive literature of the Bible as she is to use the Iliad and the Koran and the poetry of the other races, we are limiting the teacher in the use of efficient means of moral training, and therefore this is not a closed question; but teachers need not suspend moral training until this question is settled. The Bible is only one of the means. The problem of the hour is how to make the present situation and the means now within our reach yield the largest possible returns.

Educational solution. Education, morality, and religion, in fact all human development, have their roots and life principles in the instincts and impulses of the individual. The child must be thought of as a living soul. As such it is active in its own characteristic way. The child's self, its nervous and muscular systems, are already so fashioned that without previous training it promptly and definitely responds to certain necessary situations. These instinctive reactions and their consequences are reported in consciousness as pleasurable or painful, so that the act and end get meaning and value. The meaning of the act is organized into the memory by persistence and repetition until it becomes an idea. This idea in memory, along with the consciousness of its absence in reality, or its conflicts with

others, causes a tension between the idea and its realization. The imagination seizes the idea with the intent and purpose of making it real, and behold! the idea has become an ideal and the act is moral. The moral agent knows what he is about, is interested in his act, and makes it express his will. The absence of a known end and a conflict of desires cause tensions between the real and the ideal. These tensions require "worth judgements" and moral choice. These conflicts arise by the rapid ripening of instincts and impulses, and the feeling of the need of reaching a working conclusion. Instincts are classified as individualistic, reproductive, and social. The egoistic instincts preserve the individual; the reproductive instincts preserve the species; the social instincts integrate, make one, the individual and the rest of the species. Out of these instincts and the conditions requisite for their normal discharge arise the moral agent and the moral situations. James names the following instincts on which the school must build: "fear, love, curiosity, imitation, emulation, ambition, ownership, constructiveness."

Moral development consists in bringing these "native reactions" to higher levels by making them conscious, by bringing them under control, and by bringing them into right relation to each other, — i.e. organizing them into a moral character. This is done by arresting those too strong, strengthening those too weak, and making them fortify each other.

It is easy to get intellectual assent to the proposition that the aim of education is the formation of character. Disagreement arises when we analyze character into its elements and undertake to prescribe ways and means for

its development. These difficulties arise because character is viewed from the standpoint of its products rather than from the point of view of its nature and inner workings. Instincts are predispositions to particular reactions that arise from the very physiological and psychological construction of the self. They are racial habits perpetuated by heredity. The child comes into the world with a *character*, with a few well-defined ways of acting in response to specific stimuli. The fundamental constituent of character is *power*, — not blind force but directed energy, efficiency in action toward some definite result. Strong, healthy muscles, steady nerves, acute senses, and active brain powers are the storehouses of this power. From this point of view character is sometimes defined as a "completely fashioned will." Character must be strong and firm, but it must also contain the active principles of growth and development, because new situations continually arise. The second constituent is sensitiveness to situations. The native endowment of energy must be ready not only to act promptly when the occasion occurs but must respond adequately to the demands of the situation. While education is organizing the reactions into habits, it must always leave the child young and plastic enough to be instinctively sensitive to the new situations. Instinctive reactions attain results without foresight of what these results must be. Moral character secures its results by foresight of what these results ought to be. Judgment, the sense of relative values, is the selective, discriminating, directive principle of character. The school does much for the force of character, and it does much to determine the responsiveness of the self to situations, but it does this chiefly

through the enlightening and training of the judgment. From this point of view, correct moral education must consist in affording occasions for making and testing judgments.

The self is always a character, a personality, but for purposes of study and discussion it is proper to treat of three forms of control. The muscular and nervous systems are stored with energy, but with the exception of a few primary instincts their reactions are explosive, vague, and indefinite. These organs must be trained to become ready servants of the will. This requires the development of physical control. Ideas of ends and means, along with the development of muscles and nerves, develop instincts which ripen so rapidly that they conflict. Some ends must be repressed, some chosen. The means must be selected, arranged, used. This requires prudential control. In executing prudential acts and making worth judgments concerning their results, the agent discovers that the *intent* or *purpose* of the act is the only phase over which he has complete control, and discovers further that human acts may be judged both by motive and by results. Only moral acts are within the control of self. Willing to be good is being good. The moral agent chooses from conflicting impulses and holds himself responsible for his choice. This making of worth judgments and acting upon them develops the distinctions between means and ends, between good and bad, between right and wrong. This is the development of moral control.

The rise from blind instinct to moral insight is not made in a single bound. This developmental theory of morality indicates three stages. In the instinctive stage the standard

of right is egoistic, the right is the thing that the child wants to do or have. From his point of view his will makes it right to him. The child is altruistic as well as egoistic. Other persons are the chief factors in the situations favorable to the discharge of human instincts and impulses, so that more and more the right is what playmates, classmates, and parents or the social group approve and praise. Adolescent groups overlap and their standards disagree. These disagreements, along with budding religious instincts, may lead to moral insight where the soul seeks a standard universal, a standard for all, forever. Moral training must take account of these stages. The teacher must be able to diagnose each individual case and must adjust instruction and authority accordingly.

Authority and obedience. Thus far conduct has been discussed as developing from instincts and impulses, but every action is also a reaction with or against the circumstances surrounding the agent. A human being is a creature of imitation and subject to the laws of suggestion. The learning child should have the opportunity to discover the laws and forms of conduct as seen in his stronger, wiser associates, and finally in the universe as a cosmos, and voluntarily adjust his act to conform to this law as he sees it. This is obedience to authority and passes through the stages conforming to those of moral growth. Fear is not a final principle for the government of intelligent beings, but it is a primary native instinct and must be employed as a primary principle of control. The weakness and ignorance of the child makes it imperative that a stronger, wiser person exercise continuous personal oversight. The instinctive reactions of fear produce the plastic, passive

state of the body and mind, easily guided and controlled by the superior will of the one in authority. Belief, or faith, characterizes the second stage of authority. When the child has acquired strength and control of muscles, and a system of memories and images, he may be left alone in familiar situations. Belief in his own powers and in the sanity and soundness of the lessons from former acts of obedience to authority serves as an omnipresent, unseen guide to reactions. A developing organism and a progressive environment produce new situations. A higher, safer principle than fear or faith must be developed. This higher principle of insight or reason must analyze the new situations and adjust the life accordingly. In this stage the inner law of the learner's life answers back to the moral order of the universe, and the soul has discovered absolute authority, under which freedom is achieved by joyous obedience.

The principle of authority is permanent, universal, but the motive for obedience and the form of the act conforming to the authority changes with the development of knowledge and power. The absolute authority of the ancient rulers over property and life made their subjects fear them. Increase of numbers and expansion of the race removed the subjects from the presence of the rulers and made decrees and gods necessary. Men acted according to their belief in these decrees. Increasing intelligence is forcing modern civilization to base its authority upon insight and reason. The normal child passes through these racial stages. It is the privilege and duty of the educator to help him gain time by passing through these early stages quickly and safely. The evolution of the

mother, the father, and the home, along with the social bonds, have reduced the instinct of fear and its reactions to a minimum. The separation of church and state, the principle of equality before the law, the decline in the use of the catechism and the catechetical method, have greatly reduced the power of formal rules. Conduct based upon fear and faith gets its form and content from powers external to the agent. Freedom, democracy, the kingdom of heaven, is developed by substituting for these external forms of authority an inner, omnipresent principle in the form of a personal ideal to be realized. The perfect pattern for this moral ideal must be a perfect personality.

Obedience is the moral act par excellence, because the child can disobey. When he obeys he chooses a standard, chooses to have his act realize the standard, and acts according to plan. The authority, the standard, must be right; it must be rational; it must fit the developing rationality in the child. If moral sanctions get their imperative, commanding power from their being grounded in reason, in the very constitution of the human being as rational, then the child is rising into the full stature of his being when he comes to ask, "Why?" When this question arises the child has passed through the stages of fear and even of faith, and is seeking insight. Only two courses are open to the teacher. He may substitute his own insight for that of the questioning child, throw him back into the state of faith, and ask him to trust the teacher's rationality for the time being. If we have reasons sufficient for asking a child to do a thing, we need not be afraid to give them. If we cannot give them, or if the child cannot grasp them, we may at least doubt the wisdom of asking

him to do the thing at this time. If we continue to ground a child's conduct in authority represented by parent or teacher, what will he do when absent from them? The child carries his reason with him. He cannot escape it if he would, and if he has acquired the habit of judging and grounding conduct on insight he has come to be a free moral agent. What, then, becomes of authority and obedience? They are given their universal, rational basis. If the authority of teacher and parent has no deeper foundation than *ipse dixit*, democracy is in a sorry plight. Obedience to authority, to law, is the very foundation of government, because it is the foundation of moral character; but the child or citizen who submits to the directions of teacher, parent, or law, and sees no authority back of or deeper than these, is not yet moral. Moral conduct arises from within. Moral training has not done its perfect work until it has made teacher, parent, and statute unnecessary. The moral soul is a law unto itself, because it has identified itself with the universal will and order: "Thy will be done in earth as it is in heaven."

Having discovered that rational freedom or personal self-control is the aim and motive of moral training, it becomes the imperative duty of the educator to discover and apply the means for realizing this ideal with economy and efficiency.

Morality arises with the form and content of self-consciousness. When the individual knows he is a person, and knows and chooses his own motives and means in action, he is a moral person. Any group of such individuals with a common, conscious purpose is a moral organization. The school is old enough and ought to be wise enough to

know and to hold consciously and deliberately to the ethical purposes for which it is organized. The first essential step in this process is a firm grasp upon the new and increasing responsibilities of the school in the present social order. Because the school is the youngest of the five historic institutions, is supported by the members of the other social institutions, and deals with their children, almost every one presumes to advise, criticise, and even to dictate the ways and means of educating the youth. In this multitude of counselors there is confusion. The school can rise to the full dignity of a self-conscious power by making teaching a learned profession, by socializing the aims, means, and methods of the teaching process, and by socializing the school as an institution. Teaching is coming to be a learned profession because teachers are coming into possession of a body of expert knowledge and a system of expert practice. This expert knowledge concerns the nature of the child, his place in society, and the economic and skillful arrangement of the subjects and processes of learning as a means of the child's adjustment with nature and society. These bodies of knowledge are taking form under the titles of Genetic Psychology, Sociology, and Pedagogy. The first and fundamental fact for each of these sciences is the nature, dignity, and worth of the human soul. The physical sciences have done much to acquaint us with the nature and place of the child as an animal, but their deepest insight (and how grand and magnificent have been their achievements!) cannot measure this worth of the soul. These physical sciences measure the objective world in terms of space, time, and force. Space seems infinite. Not all the threads of cotton spun

would reach the nearest star. Measured by space, how small a thing is the child! Eternity stretches before us and baffles our thought. By the measure of time, how short is childhood! "Man born of a woman is of few days and full of trouble." What can we say of the child as a physical force? Compared to the mighty engines of industry, or to the power that holds the worlds in their courses, the child seems as naught. By these space, time, and force standards, man is an atom, a trifle of energy. Our estimate of man's worth and the dignity of the teaching profession is not founded upon these measurements.

"What is man, that thou art mindful of him? . . . Thou hast made him a little less than God."[1] The child is a living soul, a conscious self-activity, and can be educated because he can think of himself as he *ought* to be. This majestic, inspiring, guiding "ought" is the very essence of the human being, and makes the soul worth more than all the world besides. This was the insight of the Great Teacher, and gives the stamp of finality to his teaching concerning morality and religion. No higher, truer estimate can be put upon the human being. Consciousness of this moral worth of the child gives inspiration and rids the teacher's life of the petty annoyances of the trades and crafts. By deliberate choice the teacher has put himself into the company of prophets and seers, of Socrates and Jesus, and he must live worthy of the vocation wherein he is called. Next to the inherent moral nature of the child, the inspired moral life of the teacher is the essential moral power of the school. The instincts and impulses of the child are aroused and guided by the living teacher as an

[1] Literal translation.

ideal. How shall the teacher keep himself a pattern true to the moral order of the universe? By keeping the tentacles of his inner being sensitive to the higher things of the spirit. We may deplore contagion as the means of spreading physical disease, but the teacher must appropriate its law as a powerful means of propagating moral health. Cheerfulness is as catching as the measles, — even more so. So also are public honesty and the other virtues. Witness the call to duty in public office since the examples of Roosevelt and Folk.

The greatest power for righteousness in the school is the teacher. He is the personal embodiment of the moral ideal for the child, and as such is a personal stimulus and guide. The point of growth for both mind and morals is where the child and teacher come into vital unity in thought and action. So also the moral health and growth of the teacher depends upon the fresh moral atmosphere of a few great souls. This intimate association may be with a minister, a lawyer, a fellow-teacher, a principal, a saintly mother, even with a pupil. This life-giving moral touch should come from different angles. The teacher hungering and thirsting for righteousness will find it, even as the living plant seeks and finds the light. Another means of moral growth for both teacher and pupil is an intimate acquaintance with a few of the great teachers, — as Socrates, Aristotle, Plato, Comenius, Pestalozzi, Fröbel, Darwin, Agassiz, Goethe, Emerson. This list of rare spirits suggests the power of great books and great poems. Music and art are also great rectifiers of the spirit. A living teacher must know a few great artists and their masterpieces. An educational leader in these days must have a living, growing

interest and experience in some particular science, and also in some important industry. Above all the informational sources of inspiration and guidance, the teacher's active participation in some form of public or private charity, and the enjoyment of social events and healthy games, are means of physical and moral health and growth.

The already overburdened teacher may ask, "How can all this be done?" As well might he ask, "How can I get time to eat, when there is so much to do?" The only means of artistic ease, efficiency, and joy in teaching is this constantly growing power gained by a living touch with the sources of truth, beauty, and goodness. This demand for a high, growing moral tone in the teacher's every word and act would be discouraging if it were not so easily possible. Teaching offers a most splendid atmosphere for the growth of moral power. Situations arise to arouse every moral instinct, and they arise often enough to insure development. The teacher is actively, creatively interested in the development of children of different ages and ability. He mingles socially and professionally with his peers, — as teachers, supervisors, principals, and superintendents. He is a servant of the state, and bears an active moral relation to school boards and laws. He is in social contact with parents of different professions and trades. Best of all, the teacher has abundant opportunity to throw his influence in favor of all the moral forces of the community. What worthy moral and social opportunity does he lack?

Summary of the principles of moral growth. First, morality develops by specific acts, and each act has its root in an instinct or an impulse. Second, a social situation, the touch of life upon life, is the natural stimulus and

atmosphere for the discharge of these instincts and impulses. Third, these acts must be repeated under varying circumstances, until the motive, means, and results arise in consciousness so that the moral judgment grows. Fourth, the good acts must be made habitual, and be organized into character by selection and trial. Fifth, the standard of selection and the test of goodness is the thought and feeling of progressive unity of the individual life with the unfolding moral purposes of the world.

The highest form of moral life, then, grows by appropriate exercise under favorable conditions and circumstances. The teacher grows by the same processes as the child, and must grow at the same time; but there is the difference that makes the one a pupil and the other a teacher. The teacher must know the means and method of moral growth, and must be able to resolve them into forms suitable to the experience of the learner. This requires the teacher to know the aim of all the processes and to hold to it through every step.

Ethical aim in education. Consciousness is focal. It centers its attention upon some aspect of reality, and for the time being all other aspects are subordinate. At present the eye of man is upon the material and industrial aspect of the world as never before. The natural is set over against the supernatural, the material over against the spiritual. The soul of man pants for unity, and some men have tried to dissolve this annoying antagonism in their own minds by denying the reality of the supernatural or spiritual. But even this "monarchical constitution of consciousness," as Kant called it, cannot permanently hush the voice of conscience to the call of duty. All the wealth

of this world cannot drown the soul's longing for immortality. The god of mammon cannot stop the heart's panting after the living God. The antithesis between the material and spiritual must be dissolved, and they must be combined in a higher synthesis by a new vision of their unity. Education, morality, and religion cannot hold the minds and affections of men and regenerate them by condemning wealth and material possessions. We cannot annul the power of these by denying their reality. The moral forces of the universe must appropriate the wealth of this world and turn it to the highest uses of men.

This world movement manifests itself in education by dividing the forces into two camps, the one holding to the industrial aim, the other to the cultural aim. In subject-matter they set the sciences over against the classics, claiming that the sciences help man to secure physical freedom, and that the humanities produce spiritual worthiness. This is an insult to both sets of subjects, because it is partial and unfair. Jesus pronounced the formula for uniting these conflicting aims when he said, "Seek ye first the kingdom of God, and his righteousness, and all these things shall be added unto you." Physical freedom is a condition, a means of spiritual growth. Making a living is one of the means of living a life. The sin of the age has been in making the means an end, and thus losing both. Physical freedom cannot come by seeking it. It is realized and appreciated only when made to serve the soul's higher interests. President Tucker said of wealth, "It must be spiritualized." So the school aims, branches, and methods must be moralized. Man *has* a body; he *is* a living soul. He has a right to physical freedom, but he must use it for

the sake of the soul. What a man *has*, ought to be put to the service of what he *is* and what he hopes to be. There is no necessary antagonism between spiritual growth and physical freedom if the aim is set upon the highest. When the mind identifies an aim with an impulse, or grafts the idea of an end upon an instinct, a motive has been developed. The teacher guided by an ethical aim will inspire the children with ethical motives for work and conduct. If the teacher or child *intends* a moral action, the result, however deplorable, cannot be immoral. An act the *purpose* of which is immoral cannot result in morality, however beneficial the outcome of the act may seem to be. Neither teacher nor pupil can be indifferent to results, but it is the motive, intent, purpose, which builds the character. The first problem in moral training is how to make the motives moral. Morality has its roots in instincts and impulses, but a particular moral act is a conscious process; that is, it is under control by attention. Individual initiative is the characteristic of all acts for which the agent is responsible, but the agent responds in a situation. The incentive to an act is an inner principle. In a conscious act this inner principle is the idea of the end identified with an impulse. In the moral act it is the idea of a good end chosen. The natural results of every act are twofold: first, the effort and action in mind, brain, nerve, and muscle are reported back to consciousness as a pleasurable or painful process, and also recorded in these organs as tendencies to act again in a similar manner; second, these processes produce results objective to the agent, such as words, acts, things made. These, too, are reported back to consciousness, and finish the psychic circle of action and furnish the basis for

judging the goodness or badness of the motives, means, and methods. The ideas of these objective results are the incentives to prolonged, repeated acts, — as those of the school. It is the express business of the teacher to bring the child into the situation where these natural ends come clearly into consciousness as ideals, and then provide the occasion for the child to test the result. The child must know whether he is succeeding or failing. The end held in mind as the ideal is the motive for action, but the past results help form this ideal. The moral motives are ideas of results that follow naturally and surely from the processes they arouse. The teacher who does not know the natural incentives, and how to have the child test them, substitutes artificial ends and tests, such as per cents, prizes, rewards, immunities, or punishments. These are artificial because they are not the natural result of the process; because they cannot be grafted upon the native stock; and because they depend upon the teacher and are absent when he is absent. Moral motives are in the life, and are present there as inspirations and guides. The effects of this artificial system have been as bad upon the intellectual results as upon the moral outcome. Only a small percentage of public-school pupils continue as students and learners. After school days there is no one to set the tasks; none to give the per cents, rewards, or punishments. These facts are sufficient reasons for condemning artificial incentives.

Working to get to the head of the class, as the only motive, is unmoral, because it is unsocial. Only one can be at the head. This motive overstimulates the active, oversensitive ones, who need the stimulus least, and discourages

the inactive, weak ones, who need help most. Moral excellence is universal, open to all. Working to get to the head of the class is unmoral because it is unfair. The weakest child in the class, in scholastic attainment (on which getting ahead depends), may be more moral in intention and effort, and may be growing faster, than the one at the head. This desire to surpass others institutes an immoral basis of judgment. The child often rejoices in the failure of others because by their failure he may more easily get ahead. It institutes the comparison of himself with the failing ones, whereas the moral comparison is himself as he was with himself as he is and ought to be.

Per cents or rewards for certain degrees of excellence remove the unsocial feature, because all may attain this excellence; but this motive is still unmoral, because the child practices deceit with his own processes. He works upon spelling, or history, or geography, and gets a star, or head mark, or other thing foreign to the process, and these can be gotten by dishonest means. It is sometimes urged that pupils work harder and get more under the high pressure of the per-cent system. A few pupils may get more of the markable material, but they get less real growth. This is evident from the fact that when the per cents and rewards stop, the process stops. Both teacher and pupil are deceived. They believe that the effort and activity aroused by the intoxicating stimulus of these objects foreign to the actions yield knowledge and power; whereas the inner, higher, finer processes of the soul rebel against the procedure, and both teacher and pupil are glad when it is over. These artificial incentives cannot be carried over into life, and they kill the native thirst for knowledge.

These improper relations with the problems of thought are as unmoral as wrong motives in dealing with persons, because both are breaks in the integrity of the life process. Both are promoted by selfish ends, and the results aimed at may be secured by dishonest means.

The artificial character of the common-school period and practices appears when we compare this period with childhood before and with manhood after school. We should be anxious about the physical and mental health of a child that had to be rewarded, punished, or bribed to get it to play. So in the "school of life" we hear of professional ethics. We should count a physician morally unsound who gauged his care and skill in a case by the fee or reward. We count the mason immoral who would put bad mortar and bricks into a foundation because no reward was offered for good material. If the school period must graft its process upon the native reactions of the child, developed before the school period, and would lead the pupil to live a moral, studious, learning life after school, it must appeal to the motives native to life in and out of school. Are there then no places for rewards and punishments, for external leverage upon the pupils?

There is no place for these devices with normal, healthy minds. Upon pathological cases they may be used with wise caution as mental and moral medicines; but the teacher who needs to use these nostrums with the whole school, or a large part of it, must look to himself and other teachers as the cause of these unnatural conditions. The ingenuity and energy used in inventing and administering these foreign, traditional stimuli to action, if used in coming into living touch with truth and into individual contact

with the child, will remove the necessity. If singleness of purpose and whole-souled action are absolute conditions of healthy development in childhood, and are also sound measures of skill and morality in manhood, what right has the teacher or school to use rewards, per cents, punishments, and immunities in this formative period between infancy and maturity? Is the child and youth so abnormal a thing that truth and knowledge have no attraction for him, and that he must be bribed to exercise the functions necessary to get knowledge and skill? Our continuance in this mediæval practice, based upon the doctrine of total depravity, must be set down to the credit of our disbelief in the health and sanity of childhood and in the power of truth to nourish the soul; or it must be set down to ignorance, and failure to adjust the world of truth to the growing demands of the child's life. The native springs to conduct are the same in school as out of school; it is the high privilege and duty of the teacher to help the child to graft high, worthy aims upon these impulses. This is done by discovering the dominant interests of the child and focusing them upon the nearest related truth, beauty, and goodness. Fear and love of particular persons and things are primary instincts; they are the basis of moral motives because they are social. The teacher's approval and disapproval of the child's acts prompted by these instincts are the essential means by which the child is taught to make correct moral judgments. Imitation is the social instinct par excellence; here moral training consists in the teacher's presenting himself as a worthy example for imitation, and in pointing out other copies. Emulation is an egoistic form of imitation; it is made moral by leading the child

to emulate his former self, — to try to do better than he did, rather than to do better than some one else has done. Curiosity is the instinctive basis of knowledge; it must be kept unselfish and turned to service. Self-expression is the highest instinct; the child is made in the image of his Creator, and realizes this image by creating. Constructiveness and the instinct of ownership by effort are associated instincts. All these instincts are made the basis of moral acts by aiming to use their products for service.

Each of the school subjects must and can be moralized; they will be moralized by being socialized; they will be socialized by being made immediately serviceable both to the individual and to society. The details of the reorganization must be worked out in terms of the situation in each school district, but the guiding principles will appear to every anxious, thoughtful teacher when he substitutes the Copernican child-centered system for the old Ptolemaic subject-centered system. The natural motive for the language subjects is the social desire to communicate thought and feeling. The instinct of imitation, the desire to be like others, will start the process of learning the use of the tools of communication. The moral motive for a letter or composition is a desire and effort to tell some one something he would never know if the letter or composition were never written; for example, each child writes the invitation to his parents to attend the picture exhibition, or the next school concert, or parents' day exercises, or a ball game, or field-day sports. The anxiety to have this invitation clear, forcible, and elegant, provides the motive and stimulus for the drill upon it, and the finished product is of social service. To inform parent or teacher or other

class, brother, friend, or some one, the child composes an account of an interesting experiment or lesson or trip or what not. The absolute demands of the case to make the language true to the thing gives one of the finest opportunities for teaching accuracy of judgment and accuracy of language, — the absolute essentials of truth-getting and truth-telling. Without further elaboration it must appear to every sincere thinker that even so generally distasteful a subject as composition has almost infinite possibilities for social and moral training.

It is so with every other essential subject. What social or moral motive can a child have for oral reading when the teacher and the rest of the class sit there holding the book and silently reading the same paragraph? But suppose the reader is out in front of the class and every eye and ear is upon him, trying to build the mental picture hidden in the paragraph, testing it to see whether or not it tallies with the one gotten in study. In this social situation the child must serve the class; he must be honest and true to the author. Here also we have the motive and measure of correct interpretation and correct expression. What a new and enlivening motive for careful study beforehand! Each paragraph demands of the child all he knows of language and expression, and requires him to put it to immediate use for social service and approval. On the part of the teacher this conception of reading gives the proper motive and standard for the selection of the material.

Each branch must yield ethical fruit, because the whole educational process is fundamentally ethical. This demand in no way annuls the differences between the branches. The teacher cannot be indifferent to what or how he

teaches. He dare not omit fundamental subjects or substitute one for another. It has been objected that arithmetic and grammar do not and cannot cure lying. No sane person proposes them as cures for moral disease. They are positive means of mental growth and social intercourse. Arithmetic and grammar may not cure lying, but they are powerful tools for discovering and telling the truth. The abiding conviction that industry, social intercourse, civilization, are impossible without arithmetic, geography, science, language, literature, and history, will give inspiration and guidance in the minutest details of the schoolroom. When a teacher feels that reading and writing put a child into vital connection with the rest of the intelligent world, past and present, he does not come to his work like a driven slave or like a factory hand. This ethical content is the very lifeblood of the subject. It is not tacked on at the end by a "moral application" or a sermonette, but, like all things moral, implies insight and service, — faces toward the individual and toward society. The child does not know the multiplication table until he has insight into its universal application, and uses it as a means of communication, that is, social exchange. The power to handle spelling and numbers and geography with moral results cannot be sent to a teacher by mail, by essay, or by book. It comes by insight, but it is within easy reach of teacher and pupil. Often a mere question opens the flood gates of light. Is the multiplication table true in Germany? How long will it be true? How many races have language? It is this universal character of the branches that gives them their interest for the individual and their power for service to society, and the teacher

must use the subject for both (for the individual and for society) before it will yield insight or power.

Somewhere Emerson says, "We send our children to the master, but the boys educate them." As an organized group of persons, the school offers exercise for every essential social function. Educational theory distinguishes between instruction and discipline, and often sets them over against each other as antagonistic, or at least treating discipline as subordinate to instruction. Both processes must be viewed as means of teaching the child how to live with his fellows. A school, like a person, has a certain moral tone. The school gets this moral tension mostly from the principal and teachers, but they produce it in the children by the motives and methods they use in securing the so-called school virtues, of which Dr. Harris names four, — (1) regularity, (2) punctuality, (3) silence, and (4) industry. Dr. E. E. White adds three, — (5) neatness, (6) accuracy, and (7) obedience. These are important elements in character, and the school has occasion and means for enforcing all of them; but their efficiency in forming the moral will depends upon the motives by which they are secured. The military régime may enforce regularity and silence by methods which compel the child to explode with an Indian war whoop when he gets out on the street. These cardinal virtues may be made so distasteful that the child will be glad to be relieved from practicing them. They are conditions for good school work and are most effective when secured by indirection; the natural and possible tension between the child and the truth, and social opportunities offered at school, will induce each and every one of them. They are virtues by habit rather than by insight, so they are secured

by practice under natural motives instead of by instruction. Each is a form of self-control, and as such is fundamental in character building, but must not be held as an end. It has been assumed that if the child practice regularity, industry, and the rest of these virtues in school, he will carry the same virtues over into life. The fact is that this does not necessarily happen: the most regular attendant at the shop may be very irregular in performing home duties; the idle apprentice is not infrequently an industrious billiard player. These so-called virtues must not be minimized, but they are only conditions, and must be moralized by proper interests and ideals. The successful bank robber would practice all of them in a single robbery. Habits are the tools of virtue; character supplies the motives that use them.

The spontaneous, instinctive, free activity of the playground is the natural and important antithesis of the controlled action in the schoolroom. It develops the school virtues, too, but by self-made rules. Play develops social agreement: the players make rules governing the individual grounds and situations, and then joyously obey them because they are their own and they see the necessity for them; they play by rule so that they can play with others. Play develops natural leadership and the possibilities in play make this dangerous: tyranny may develop; brute force may be substituted for leadership; individual initiative may be suppressed. So school play needs to be skillfully supervised, and supervision is most effective when least obtrusive. Supervision provides suitable means, places, and groupings of children, and interchange of groups. Fair play, a square deal, is the keynote. As President

Tucker well said, "Morality is of most use where it is most difficult to get." The development of the spirit of fair play in a place as free as the playground is one of the school's greatest opportunities to teach morality.

The subjects of instruction as means of moral training. Every rational act is a means of developing moral character. Since the aim of education and of life is ethical, a subject of instruction proves its right to a place in the school course by contributing to ethical development. One of the most unfortunate mistakes in educational theory and practice has been the treating of some truths as secular and others as sacred. It is said that "education is a doubtful factor, having to do with the intellect, and giving reckless power unless restrained by a religious heart; that it (education) is an affair of this world, to satisfy hunger and pride, while religion is for eternity, satisfying and saving the soul." Paulsen has well said, "We have no more right to appeal to God as the cause in morals than in physics."[1] The universe of human life is organized and made possible by the law of moral order, as the physical universe is held together by the law of gravity. They are different laws, but both are God's laws, and therefore sacred. Violation of either is sure to bring punishment. The laws of health are as sacred as the ten commandments. "Two times two equals four" is as universal and as sacred as "Thou shalt not steal." Discovering the sacredness of the truths of the common-school branches in no way lessens the sacredness of the truths formerly classed as sacred. It is a leveling-up process, and gives new meaning to every fact and lesson.

[1] *Ethics*, p. 341.

Clear, vital knowledge is a great power for righteousness. We may define truth as the correspondence of the processes in the mind to the fact in the thing. "When the thought in the mind fits the fact, and the word on the tongue fits the thought, the circuit of truth is complete." From this standpoint nature study and the natural sciences offer the finest opportunity for truth-getting and truth-telling. The object is there, inviting the student to square his thought and his language with it. Intellectual honesty is the first requirement, as well as one of the highest results of the scientific method.

Mathematics is the so-called exact science. With the same data every pupil must come to absolutely the same result. Its conclusions are universal. The language and processes of mathematics are perfect instruments for measuring quantitative values. It has the finest tools for making worth judgments concerning matter and force, and is the only means of confidence in social exchange of commodities.

As the portrayal of the real struggles of men for industrial and spiritual freedom, history furnishes great examples of moral choice and moral action. It inculcates the lesson of suspending judgment until the facts are known.

Literature will always hold the first place as a means of moral training, because it gives the ideal examples of the moral struggle for freedom. In literature the inner voice of the soul is answering back to the voice of the brook and the bird and the flower, revealing that the world within is in unity with the world without in the struggle to express its divine essence.

The school arts — reading, writing, drawing, and music — present occasions for control of mind and muscles.

They are all means of social exchange of thought and feeling. They have social standards and require approval and disapproval, individual and social. Music, for example, demands the control of the breathing, the management of the voice in pitch and movement in harmony with the rest of the class. Much of the emotional uplift of music comes from the sense of unity in action with others. The highest and finest results in character come from the æsthetic elements in all the arts, because the essence of beauty is unity, harmony; but these arts are essential means of moral character in a social being aside from their æsthetic elements; they are the means of training the child in social coöperation.

Maxims: their power and use. The advocates of moral and religious training have relied mainly upon moral maxims, rules, and commandments. Students of biography are struck with the readiness with which great men like Socrates, Jesus, Franklin, Washington, and Lincoln applied the appropriate maxims to trying situations. The erroneous conclusion has often been drawn that the uprightness and power of their lives was produced by these formulas, whereas the truth is that these maxims are the products of their lives. This singular inverting of the process is another example of the effort to put old heads on young shoulders, or, translated into the new psychology, to put old brains upon young spinal cords. It is quite possible to run the words of those maxims into the brain, either through the eye as letters or through the ear as sounds, and even to have them run out again through hand or mouth, and yet they may have no power over the life. The words of the Ten Commandments or the Golden Rule

may run through the language machinery of the child and not rise into the higher regions of thought or run down into the nerves and muscles of action. The Golden Rule does not tell us what to do in a particular situation, and has no power to make us do it if it did. The devil can cite Scripture for his purpose; he used it to tempt Jesus, and it had no power in his mouth; but when Jesus cited Scripture the devil fled. The life gives power and meaning to the maxim; education must put the maxim into the life, and then it will be in the mouth ready for the occasion. We dare not reverse this process; putting it into the mouth does not insure its reaching the springs of conduct. Maxims, rules, commandments, are generals, not particulars, and, like all generals, come at the end of a teaching process to be carried over into action under new situations. A rational being must analyze a new situation before he can act morally. The maxim or rule is a powerful tool of analysis. The Golden Rule does not tell how to do in this new situation, but it does provide a method for analyzing the case, though it can do this only when it has been taught as a method for analyzing social situations. All this must not discourage us in the use of maxims, but must inspire and guide us in their right use. These moral maxims of the moral leaders are of inestimable value when used as formulas, as generalizations. "To repeat the formulas of knowledge, and to possess that knowledge, are two quite different things."[1] There is no such principle as "knowledge for knowledge's sake." Knowledge has no "sake." It is for the sake of life, and must function as a guide in the psychic circle of action before it is knowledge.

[1] Aristotle.

The school of the future will take on more and more the form of a workshop, the form of the laboratory where knowledge is made vital by being put to immediate use. This does not imply a change of equipment or a change of subjects (except the addition of manual training where this has not already been introduced) so much as it implies a new point of view.

The recitation. The well-conducted recitation is a social event. It is a joint search after truth; a friendly, helpful criticism of wrong steps; a social approval of right answers or steps; a feeling of social dependence and individual independence. The possibilities for developing the social, ethical judgment upon self and others in the recitation has not been dreamed of by most teachers. A real recitation consists of an individual act, class judgment passed upon it, and a final joint agreement on essentials. In play, in work, in the recitation, the leaders will appear.

Leadership. In a democracy the development of intelligent, competent leaders is as important as the development of the common intelligence. A great function of the teacher is to discover genius and ability and give it scope for exercise. Any programme, course of study, or school machinery that limits any child's power is unjust and undemocratic. Under the present school machinery it is safe to say that the bright, competent pupil suffers more than the dull one. According to popular judgment, one of the most grievous faults of the teacher is "partiality." Popular judgment errs, however, in its mathematical interpretation of impartiality. Impartiality does not mean equal marks, equal lessons, equal time, to each pupil. It does mean that each child shall have the opportunity to use all

its talents. The only kind of partiality which condemns a teacher is giving partial views of truth, and thereby giving partial opportunities to exercise all the life functions to their healthy limit.

Punishment, and the reformation of the wrongdoer. Good character is a positive moral force, and moral training teaches the free moral agent what is "that good and perfect will," and trains him in the execution of right ends chosen. In spite of the teacher's instruction and example, the child may choose to act against his own better self and against the school, and must be restored to unity with his own judgment, the school, and the moral order of the world. In *Social and Ethical Interpretation* Mr. Baldwin has shown that society is a psychological organism, and that unity of purpose and action is the primary necessity for development and progress. In this formula we have the standard and measure for right and wrong conduct and for punishment. Wrong conduct is disorganization, disunity, breaking the law of the moral order. The purpose of punishment is to restore the child to normal, healthy action, and to unity with himself and society. Educationally, punishment, or any act which causes a breach between teacher and pupil, between pupil and the school or society, is wrong, indeed immoral; because morality consists in a progressive harmonizing of the individual life with the moral order. Punishment, then, may be immoral in its consequences, even when administered with the best of intentions. The new social order demands a reorganization of our theories and practices in punishment. The importance of this appears in the fact that studies of the inmates of our reform schools, jails, and penitentiaries show that most

of these wrongdoers were wrongdoers at school and were, in a large percentage of cases, punished in school for the very form of evil for which they have been committed to these penal institutions. Many school punishments do not cure. It is unfair, because untrue, to point to the schools as the positive cause of crime; but it is true that the schools have not cured boys and girls of criminal tendencies which manifest themselves in school. The positive, permanent restoration of the wrongdoer to unity with his higher self and with society too seldom enters our heads and hearts as administrators of correction and punishment. Punishment is pain, and, like all pain, should help bring about normal conditions. When the child, instead of looking upon his wrong act as the cause of the pain, looks upon the teacher or society as the real cause of his punishment, he is being further separated from the school unity. The teacher and the means of punishment must not take the child's attention away from the causal relation between his act and his punishment. Herein appears the immorality of keeping a pupil after school, or of assigning school lessons as punishments, such as the committing of poetry or portions of history to memory, writing lists of words, etc. A thirteen-year-old boy stole another pupil's lunch and lied about it. He was ordered by the principal to commit two pages of the Constitution of the United States. It was not learned at 3.30 P.M. The boy appealed to the principal to extend the time because he had a paper route and needed to meet the four o'clock train. The principal refused, no doubt thinking that this increased the punishment. Could the committing of the Constitution teach the boy the heinousness of lying and stealing? Was there

any time to think about his deeds? If he had not been caught, or if there had been no Constitution, he might not have been punished. Did the principal's making him break his engagement with the paper company and with his patrons teach him to be truthful?

From the educator's standpoint, the purpose of punishment is the reformation of the wrongdoer. Discipline and punishment are teaching processes as much as are grammar or arithmetic lessons, and when we remember that conduct and behavior is the whole of life, we must welcome the occasions for discipline and even for punishment. No sane person is glad that a child's instincts, impulses, and habits have taken wrong forms, but the real teacher is glad that these forms manifest themselves, so they may be worked over into correct reactions. The teacher is not glad that the child has a disposition to cheat, but he is glad that, since this disposition is in the child, the symptom has manifested itself in such a way that he can get at the wrong reaction and transform it into self-reliance and independence. The principle of punishment, as stated by Spencer, is, "The punishment must be of the nature of the offense, and proportioned to it." The difficulty in applying this formula arises from mistaking the nature of the offense; but if we hold firmly to the instinctive basis of morality and remember that the wrong arises within, in the choice, in the will, the problem becomes quite simple. If the pupil willed to break the law, to break with his better self, with the social group, the punishment, to be of the same nature, must work upon his will rather than upon his hands or his hide. The pupil restores himself and the school to wholeness by reversing his choice. Here we have the means of

measuring the amount, — just enough to bring about the reversing. The prevalent mistake in punishment is the teacher's thinking he must do something to vindicate his authority, and the mechanical view of life and morality suggests the employment of some external, mechanical means, such as a strap, a slap, an ugly, cross sentence, or some other evidence of "the great gulf fixed" between himself and the pupil under discipline. When a child has broken the law, nothing the teacher can do will vindicate his own authority. The teacher's power and right is asserted by the child's reversing his choice and act and accepting the teacher's standards and interpretations of the law. In cases of rebellion and insubordination the family, the school, and the state still resort to force and corporal punishment. This form of punishment is a relic of the times of slavery, and the teacher who has not developed insight into the power of free human will over conduct, and discovered means of putting it to work, is afraid and in bondage when forbidden to use muscle force in management. Again, there are communities where parent and pupil expect corporal restraint. Order must be preserved, and authority must be vindicated ; open rebellion, in family and school as well as in the state, must be met with force enough to bring the rebellious spirit into that state of submission where real redemptive work may be begun. A teacher might be excused for using corporal punishment in self-defense, but could hardly be excused for bringing about the necessity for it. Muscular resistance and bodily pain are only the beginnings of the punishing process, and the restoration to unity must be begun after the use of the rod. Except in cases of rebellion the rod has widened the

breach between pupil and authority, between the child and the teacher, and has complicated the process. It is possible to whip a child and then follow up the whipping by that sympathy and guidance that drowns the animal spirits of resistance aroused by the pain; but the teacher who can do this after the use of the rod could have done it more easily before, except in cases of rebellion or where the child voluntarily chooses this form of punishment. The most ardent wielder of the birch always admits that corporal punishment is an extremity, and the child knows this, too. The child knows also that when he is bigger he will not be punished in this way. This is President Eliot's argument against corporal punishment, and it is sound. This idea of getting even with the one in authority, or even of being relieved of punishment when his muscles are strong enough, is poor material for a democracy whose life depends upon union founded upon intelligence and morality. Punishment, and all other school exercises, must bring the child into a more vital unity with his higher self and with his social group; and any means that secures this is justified by the result, but the artist secures his ends skillfully and easily. The good is the enemy of the best because it may be substituted for the best. The application of this theory of punishment requires accurate insight into the nature of the wrong to be righted.

Wrong acts arise from three sources: ignorance, — not knowing what is right; thoughtlessness or carelessness, — not knowing or caring what the efficient means of securing good results are; and action contrary to knowledge, — not knowing the terrible results of such action. For all these wrong acts the child must be punished in the sense that he

must come to be sorry for the results and choose to have them different. In the last analysis these acts arise from three phases of ignorance, and the teacher's function in each is that of helper and counselor. Most of the bad results from punishment in home, school, and state, arise from the wrong attitude of the ones in authority. They act as if the wrong were against them. They assume the assertive, aggressive, instead of the sympathetic, helpful attitude. This arises from a number of causes, traditional and practical, but chiefly from lack of insight into the nature of human life. The teacher forgets that there are two persons before him in the person of the one, — the past pupil who did the wrong act, and the present self who must take the consequences. The railing against the past wrongdoer does little good; helping to bear the consequences and avoid the repetition is always appreciated, and almost always accepted. The normal child is potentially good and potentially criminal. It is the single eye upon the pupil potentially good that gives guidance and that can induce sympathy and loving help; the attention upon the wrong act shows up the criminal. The teacher has a right to be against the criminal, but he can only be against him effectively by being for the good: overcome evil with good. Punishment is at one with the other forms of instruction in process and method; the subject-matter is different.

Wrong acts due to ignorance are most easily handled and most easily overlooked. Many more serious wrongs would be avoided by careful handling of these cases. In primary grades, in the first phase of authority, the mere disapproval of the teacher stamps the act as wrong and induces rapid reconciliation. In the second stage, the social disapproval,

— the fact that the group disapproves, — is enough. If a grammar-school pupil or a high-school pupil sins through ignorance, he should study the case until the reasons for its being wrong are clearly seen, and the means for correct redress clearly understood.

Wrong acts due to thoughtlessness or carelessness are easily diagnosed. The offender says, "I did not think," or "I did not mean to,"or "I could not help it"; — all negative statements. These careless, thoughtless ones must be led to spur themselves by proper motives to positive, definite, controlled action.

Wrong acts due to action contrary to knowledge are positively immoral and must be handled as such. The ignorance in this case is not of what is right, or of how to do the right; it is lack of insight into the consequences of the wrong act. In this case the offender must face his deed until the consequences are clearly in consciousness. No situation requires more moral poise, insight, and tact, than a case of wrongdoing. Poise reveals controlled strength. This inspires confidence, and if need be fear, on the part of the wrongdoer. The teacher has no right to worry over the wrong deed of the child. He must welcome it as a symptom expressing a state of mind and character that needs reforming. The wrongdoer must do the worrying. The only ground for the teacher's worrying is lack of insight into the principles for restoring the wayward child to the straight and narrow way. Insight is the source of poise. It inspires confidence by revealing the power to help the wrongdoer and by indicating when the offender is reformed. Tact has been defined as the power to touch an individual instance with a universal law; insight, then, is a

fundamental requirement, because it reveals this law. The wrongdoer must face his deed and make restitution, as far as possible, both to himself and to the school and to society. The psychological stages by which wrongs are righted are the same in education, morality, and religion. The offender looks backward upon the deed and then traces its consequences upon self and upon others. This requires the prospective view. Having discovered the wrong and the right, he must will allegiance to the ideal. Religious thinkers have given more attention to this process, and name the stages "repentance," "faith," and "consecration." The practical problem of the teacher is how to help the child through all these stages. It must be repeated that the wrongdoer must do the work. The teacher stands ready to help, but the child must be left alone to work out his own salvation unless he asks help. Teachers must quit their talking in cases of punishment if they expect reformation to take place. It is a process in the child's will. No finer lesson on moral regeneration is known than the parable of the prodigal son. Wrongdoing is disunity, discord, separation. Taking his portion away; leaving his father; going into a far country; riotous living; association with swine; hungry, and no man gave to him,—these are so many expressions of this principle of wrong as separation and discord. The regeneration is described as "coming to himself." "I will arise and go to my father, and will say unto him, . . . Make me as one of thy hired servants." The father's act in this parable indicates the teacher's function. The pupil is disorderly in line when marching into school: if the principle of the parable is applicable to this case we shall see its universality and validity. This act is clearly a case of

disunity, lack of harmony. The pupil is bodily and spiritually out of school by his own act. He has gone into the far country; is riotous. If all the pupils did so they would break up the school. What must he do? He must restore himself to unity with the school. This requires, first, a clear sense of his separation, his disunity, and a desire to be back in harmony with the school. He will not have this desire if he does not have faith in the school or in something there. His third act is to set about using his self-control to put himself in unity with the school.

The safest, sanest way to get the child to face his deed is to ask him to write out a clear, accurate account of what happened. Here is a fine occasion for training the ethical judgment. There are two factors in the moral act, — the agent and the situation. Adam-like, the wrongdoer omits the agent, and writes about the "other fellow." Of course this must not be accepted. It may be necessary in extreme cases to ask the child to omit everything but references to the agent until he sees that it is his deed. Writing the account is better than oral narration; children are more accurate in writing, and less likely to be untruthful; it is down in black and white; the teacher can take his time to study it, if need be. In a written account each child must depend upon himself; the wise teachers handle offenders individually. After an accurate account of the act comes the explanation of the wrong in the case. Writing answers to the question "Why is such an act wrong?" brings a child to view the consequences, present and future. It must be remembered that the consequences are twofold, — to himself and to the school; his answer must not be accepted until he states the results upon both. Having

clearly in mind the evil results of the act, the offender is ready for the question, "What can I do about it?" This is the essential step in the process, and if the child says he will see to it that it shall not occur again, and sees a way of escape from doing it in the future, and if the teacher is sure that the child knows what all this means, then his paper and plan must be accepted with the hearty assurance that the teacher is glad and ready to help him.

The timid teacher objects, and says, "Suppose the child will not worry?" There can hardly be such a case; but if it should so occur, no other treatment is possible. If a wrongdoer will not face his deed, he cannot be reformed. Suppose the extreme possibility: the child refuses to write, or says he is not going to do anything about it. This seems to be a case where the teacher *must do something*. In reality it is the case where he can do nothing, except announce this fact. The teacher might say, "If you are not in harmony with what you ought to be and with the rest of the school, you are *out* by your own choice, and that ends it." And so it does as far as the teacher is concerned. One can hardly imagine a child who would not at once wonder what to do, and go to thinking.

In cases where the child says he does not know what to do, the teacher must help by question and suggestion. Three cautions need to be always in the mind of the teacher:

1. The cunning frailty and common device of man is to divert the attention from the real issue when caught in a fault. In this case the teacher's function is the same as in the recitation. He must help the child hold firmly and successfully to the subject under discussion. This is real moral control.

2. There is no need for hurry. Teachers overestimate the importance of the prescribed work as over against this work called discipline; this should take precedence over everything else. It is well if the child can complete the process in a moment, but it must not be dropped until it is completed, even if it takes a whole day, or days. The offender should at once know that he must solve this personal problem before he undertakes anything else.

3. The process is not finished until the child plans a way of doing right the next time in a similar situation that might suggest the wrong. In general this consists in selecting and fixing a suggestion to inhibition, or providing a line of action occupying consciousness so that the old suggestion is inoperative. In nine cases out of ten the child will work this out successfully. In the other case he needs help and careful instruction and supervision.

Suppose the child outlines the reform process correctly, says he understands the case, sees why his act was wrong, and, having planned a way of escape for the future, does not escape, but repeats the deed. This might be from either of three causes: he did not understand the case, he did not will to be good, or habit is his master. Now he has the additional problem of discovering which is the cause and planning accordingly. He must give sound evidence of sincerity and determination, and then receive sympathetic help and approval.

Socializing the school as an institution. A child's moral standards in action are essentially those of his compeers and associates. Moral training must appeal to and use these standards. The teacher cannot appeal to standards very much above those of the community. This implies

that the teacher is bound to know the school district and raise the moral standard where it is low. The school effort must receive the hearty support of the family and society as represented by the community. To coöperate efficiently the school and the home must be better acquainted. The present situation demands that the school be made the social center for juvenile activities. The school equipment, yards, pictures, books, and all pertaining to the school, belong to the people. What reason other than tradition is there for using this costly plant but five hours a day, five days a week, and ten months a year? Man is a social animal; the saloon and the club owe their power and fascination to this fact. From these the child is rightly excluded. Is there any good reason why the school plant should not be used for social intercourse of such a character that the children might take part in it? The monthly concerts by the children may provide a social motive for drill in music. The task of practice on musical instruments might be enlivened by the social motive to play in the school orchestra. The dramatic instinct will insure an exercise as good as the cheap theater, and with infinitely better results. Exhibits, games, many forms of social gatherings will suggest themselves to the school anxious to correlate its moral forces with those of the family and community. We have the peculiar method of observing holidays (holy days) by suspending school activities. On these days many go to the races, games, theaters. A part of these gala days might with profit be given to games between schools, or between classes of the same school, inviting the community.

Education, then, aims by means of social stimulus, guidance, and control, to help the child to grow into a well-

rounded human being. Communities and social groups have instituted schools for the purpose of furnishing conditions favorable to this growth. The school realizes this purpose by providing suitable situations for the appropriate exercise of the essential functions of conscious life. Conscious life is an organic complex, sensitive and responsive to nature and society. The *whole* — nature, society, and the child — is a progressive moral order developing according to inherent laws and principles. Education is the progressive development of the child in response to the order in nature and society. The result of this adjustment of individual life to the order of nature and society is a *moral person.*

Morality cannot be added to or subtracted from human life. It is its essence. Moral training is not put into a school by giving it a special period on the daily programme. This would seem to be evidence that there are periods when morality is not present. Moral training is not omitted in school because not named in the course of study; but the highest types of manhood and womanhood are developed only in schools where every subject and every exercise is inspired and guided by a high moral purpose. The educational problem, then, is ethical from center to circumference. The child, as a self-activity, is its center. It is a moral being. The rest of the universe is the environmental means of the child's education. It, too, is an august moral order. Moral training brings this unfolding child of God into progressive adjustment with the moral order of the universe by the knowledge of the truth. This is Jesus' formula for freedom. He has proved to be the greatest moral lever in history. He is raising the race in morality not so much by rule or maxim as by developing insight into

the worth and dignity of the individual life, and also by leading man to accept his method of developing the greatest worth by social service. The educator's purest inspiration, as well as his greatest reward, is the abiding consciousness that he is actively and intelligently coöperating with the highest and holiest powers of the world in producing its noblest product, — the free moral agent. The teacher's sustaining and guiding principle in this labor of love is the thought that he and his pupil individually and jointly achieve this freedom by joyous obedience to the laws of life discovered by whole-souled allegiance to the highest ideal.

Charles Edward Rugh

Principal of Bay School
Oakland, California

II

THE NECESSITY FOR MORAL TRAINING IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS

THIS necessity must be judged in view of the nature and purpose of the public schools.

A public school is not a charity. Its direct object is not the benefit of the children. If it were, attendance, like accepting alms, would involve some loss of self-respect.

A public school, moreover, is not merely a form of co-operative or communal action on the part of parents, based on the fact that a number of families can educate their children more efficiently and more cheaply in a joint or common school than they can by acting independently of each other. If this were the basis of public education, school taxes ought in justice to be assessed only on property owners who have children to be taught. The fact that all property must contribute to the school funds in equal proportion proves that the true ground of public education must be found elsewhere. The school does not stand simply *in loco parentis* to the child, and therefore the parent is not the only and final arbiter as to what shall be taught to his children.

A public school is a school established by the state or nation[1] to train the children of the nation for the

[1] The words "state" and "nation" will be used interchangeably in this essay as denoting the civil society, and without reference to the distinction between our states and the general government. When the word "state" is used of a state in the American Union it will be printed with a capital letter.

responsibilities and duties of citizenship. In a republic, where all the people participate in the government, an ignorant and untrained citizenship is a public peril. The nation therefore undertakes the work of public education in the exercise of its inherent right of self-preservation. The Latin maxim, *salus populi suprema lex* — the safety of the people is the supreme law — affords the true ground for any system of public schools. What is necessary in the public schools must therefore be judged necessary with regard to the existence and welfare of the nation.

Is moral training necessary on this ground in the public schools?

1. *The moral powers are an essential part of human nature* and cannot, therefore, be ignored in any adequate plan of public education. None will deny that man is a moral being. The power to discern between right and wrong, and the sense of moral obligation constitute the chief distinction between man and the lower orders of being. The man in whom the moral sense is wanting is a defective and abnormal man.

But the interests of the republic require that all her citizens, as far as possible, be normal and perfect men. There is no human faculty which may not at any time be called into the service of the state. And since conscience, or the sense of duty, is an essential human faculty, it cannot be consistently ignored in the training of the citizen.

We accept the application of this argument to other human powers. The nation has need of the physical powers of her people in subduing the wilderness, in cultivating and gathering the annual harvests, in increasing the national wealth, in accomplishing public improvements, and in resisting the ravages of disease. Therefore, that the

physical tasks of the nation may be wrought successfully, and that the physical strength of the nation may not decline in successive generations, the study of physiology and physical exercises are properly embraced in public-school education. The state has still greater need of intelligence and mental power in her citizens, and her schools are properly adjusted to meet this need. By the same reasoning it appears that since the moral faculties are also a part of human nature they ought to be contemplated in any system of public education, and the school system which fails at this point is defective and incomplete.

But our argument rises easily to higher ground than this. Not only is conscience, or the moral sense, one among other faculties of man, but it is the most important faculty, because it is the regulative faculty, and on its right action depends the right and beneficent action of all the other faculties. All education increases or multiplies power. But why should we increase power unless we also provide for the wise and beneficent use of that power? We teach a child to write. In so doing we enlarge his powers. But if he employs that acquisition of power in forging his neighbor's signature with fraudulent intent, it would have been better for himself and better for the community if he had never learned to write. Or as Rufus King, the lawyer, said in the celebrated school case in Cincinnati: "Why should I be taxed to educate my neighbor's child if the education you give him only makes the little rascal twice as sharp, without any additional protection to my throat?"

2. *For the service which the nation demands of her citizens, moral qualifications are of paramount importance.* There are four great tasks which are regularly devolved

upon American citizens, each one of which illustrates the paramount necessity for moral qualifications. These tasks are (1) to give testimony in courts of justice, (2) to serve as jurors, (3) to vote at elections, (4) to hold office when elected. For the due discharge of these civil duties intelligence and a measure of mental training are imperatively necessary. Public justice is absolutely dependent on intelligent testimony from the witnesses in court; without intelligence and the ability to weigh evidence the juror is incompetent and valueless; without mental training how can the citizens judge of the questions at issue on election day and of the merits and claims of parties and candidates? Nor can even the humblest office, much less the higher, be filled to the advantage of the people by men who are ignorant and untrained. The state does well to educate intellectually her whole people in order that these civil duties may be well performed. But if intelligence and mental culture are necessary in these premises, is it not self-evident that moral principle and moral character are infinitely more important? What avails the intelligence of the witness if he purposely gives false testimony? or any mental training of the juror if he knowingly brings in an unjust verdict? or of the voter if he sells his vote? or of the officeholder if he is incapable of being bound by his oath of office? The education which has not instructed the citizen in these moral obligations, and developed his moral sense to be conscious of their supremacy, has not fitted him for the responsibilities of citizenship.

3. *The evils from which the nation suffers most, and the dangers which she chiefly dreads, are moral evils and dangers.* To a certain extent we fear and suffer from physical

or material ills. Poverty, sickness, the operation of natural forces such as fire and flood, the earthquake and the thunderbolt, excite the apprehensions of all, and it is the manifest duty of government to guard the people, as far as possible, against these ills. Hence public education is wisely adapted to assist man's mastery of the forces of nature; to teach the people to use these forces and bend them to their service, — to harness the waters to their burdens and train the lightnings to carry their messages. But to every thoughtful mind the ravages of vice and crime are immeasurably more detrimental to human happiness and welfare than are all other causes of loss and suffering. When we think of the misery entailed by these moral evils upon the innocent, as well as of the retributions visited upon the guilty; of the tears shed by parents over filial ingratitude and disobedience; of the lives destroyed by dissipation as well as by the hand of violence; of the homes ruined by adultery and seduction and of the murders which so often follow; of the shames and miseries, the social pollutions, and the consequences to children often involved in even one divorce case, and of the fearful aggregate of these evils involved in the tens of thousands of divorce cases which pass through our courts in a single year; when we consider our occasional exposures of social, commercial, and political corruption, and ask ourselves, "If these things appear on the surface, what must the depths conceal?"—we must admit that the whole sum of human suffering caused by physical agencies is not worthy to be named in comparison with the results of our moral evils. Moreover, our physical ills are, in large measure, traceable ultimately to moral causes, being the retribution which follows sin under the moral government of God.

Moral corruption, when it becomes widespread, threatens the very existence of governments and nations. The nations which have perished in the past have perished because of their vices and crimes. It is not written that any nation ever perished through mere material calamities.

How, then, can a nation most effectually combat the moral evils and dangers which beset and threaten her? Not by force; mere force has no place on these moral battlefields. Methods of repression which consist chiefly in the application of force tend rather to spread and intensify moral evils. Moral evils can be combated only by moral forces. Every moral evil grows up out of some falsehood, and the only instrument with which to extirpate it is truth. In her system of public schools, reaching to every hamlet and gathering the children from every home, holding them under instruction during the plastic and formative period of youth, the state has an incomparable agency for resisting and destroying the moral evils which threaten her life and welfare. It was long since a German maxim, "What you would have appear in the life of a nation you must put into its schools." An American educator has said, "The school is society shaping itself." These maxims and these arguments point to the same conclusion, — that if these moral evils are to disappear from the life of the nation, and if American society is to "shape itself" into a purer and nobler national character, it must be through the agency of public education devoted definitely and of set purpose to the moral training of our citizens.

4. *It is the unquestionable right and the imperative duty of the nation to perpetuate her moral character by training her citizens into that character.* A nation's right to transmit

her actual character to the nation of the future by impressing that character on the coming generation is one of the undisputed principles of statesmanship. Every nation does it in many different ways, — by the institutions she establishes, and which tend to perpetuate themselves; by the monuments she sets up and the inscriptions she places upon them; by her instruments of government and state papers and by the sentiments they contain. She could not avoid exercising this molding power even if she would. And if she may do so in these other ways, then still more may she do so in the most pervasive and efficient of all ways, — through her public schools.

We do this constantly, zealously, as to our republicanism. In season and out of season, through all our channels of influence upon the minds of the people, we inculcate the superiority of republican institutions. Nor do we hesitate because some of our own citizens, or of our immigrant population, may possibly have differing convictions. We feel, we know, that we no more wrong or injure a monarchist who may be resident among us by teaching our republicanism than we do by being republican; we have the same right to inculcate the superiority of our form of government that we have to establish it.

Now the American nation has a certain well-defined moral character. It is not a perfect character; it is still in process of development; but, in so far as we have a moral character, with certain well-defined features, we have the right to train the generation that is coming after us to believe in and to practice the virtues which compose it. The moral character of this nation includes such traits as these: obedience to law, regard for the rights of men, love

of liberty, regard for the sanctity of oaths, respect for the monogamous family, abhorrence of drunkenness and of social vice, public faith or the keeping of treaties and compacts, and respect for the day of rest and worship. That multitudes among us are not possessed of these virtues, and that the people as a whole, through their State and national governments, have often disregarded them, is no objection to our argument. The fact remains that these virtues are commanded in our laws, they are enforced in our courts, they have wrought as vital forces in our history, they have given tone to our literature, and the nation believes they lie at the foundation of our national prosperity. We rightly deem them of supreme importance; we could better allow all our wealth, the accumulation of centuries of toil and self-denial, to perish in one fell disaster than allow ourselves to be robbed of these elements in our moral character as a nation. Whether we shall in years to come be a numerous people, — reckoning our population by hundreds of millions, — or a wealthy people, or a learned and scholarly people, or a refined people adorned with the graces of intellectual and æsthetic culture, are all of infinitely less importance than the question whether we shall be a virtuous, law-abiding, incorruptible, God-fearing, faith-keeping people. The foundation of all public welfare is the virtue of the people; this has been the chief factor, heretofore, in our national welfare and progress. If we lose this, and become prevailingly a corrupt and vicious people, nothing can sustain the fabric of our unparalleled material prosperity and our general social happiness. Possessing a certain well-defined moral character, and having these convictions as to its importance, the nation has the unquestionable right,

and is under the most solemn obligations, to train her future citizens in that moral character and in those underlying principles in which our national morality has its roots and out of which it springs.

The force of this argument is greatly enhanced with the American people when we consider the heterogeneous multitudes of immigrants who are flocking to our shores. Last year we received from foreign countries an addition of 1,026,499 persons to our population. Some of these bring strength and help to the best forces in our national life. All who are refugees from oppression and from burdensome social conditions abroad we cordially welcome, even though we know that many of them are not in accord with the distinctive moral features of our national character. Many of them antagonize laws designed to elevate the character and improve the morals of the people. Their attitude makes slower and more difficult the uplift and moral progress of the whole nation.

As we face this problem, it is clear that among the agencies which the nation can employ directly, the public school must be our main reliance. The adult immigrant will not be easily or quickly changed; his habits are fixed; his opinions have crystallized; but his children, in their formative years, go into the public school, there to be assimilated to the national character. If the most important elements in our national character are moral elements, then our public schools must give a foremost place to the moral elements in education. We plant ourselves on the unassailable principle that every nation has the unquestionable right and is bound by the highest duty to transmit to future generations those elements in her own moral

character which she deems dutiful and valuable, and which she would preserve and develop.

Again, our argument rises easily and naturally to still higher ground when we consider our fifth point.

5. *Every nation has the right and is in duty bound to lift her moral character toward still higher standards.* She has no right to be content with the simple transmission of her character as it exists at any given period in her history. In the remedial dispensation under which we live, it is man's privilege and duty to strive ever toward perfection. This is as true of man socially as of each individual man. Every nation ought to be able to say, "One thing I do; forgetting the things which are behind, and stretching forward to the things which are before, I press on toward the goal," — of moral perfection. To this end, — the production of a nobler race, — a nation's laws and her courts, her activities and her aspirations, her struggles and her conflicts, ought all to be consciously and purposely directed. All her material successes and enrichments ought to be held and used as means to this higher end. The natural desire of parents that it may be better with their children than it has been with themselves finds in this moral progress of the nation its highest and worthiest fulfillment. The philanthropist's hopes for mankind rest largely on the hope that all nations will yet, one after another, accept the moral improvement of their people as the one goal toward which all will strive in generous emulation and with self-denying devotion. But in this noblest of all national enterprises the nation has at command no instrument, no agency, which for wide extent and for efficiency can be compared with the public schools.

We have a fine example of a nation's aspiration and effort toward the moral uplifting of her people in the scientific temperance instruction laws now to be found on the statute books of every State in the American Union. In this way, through the action of their legislatures and their public schools, the American people are striving to free themselves in future years from the curse of drink. Standing calmly on the ground of facts scientifically ascertained, and making these facts the content of her instruction, the nation is not deterred by the differing opinions of many of her citizens, nor by the opposition of some parents to the teaching of these facts to their children, nor by the clamor of interests which may be adversely affected by the results of such instruction. Already the beneficent results of this wise legislation are apparent in the life of the nation. Is it not then the highest wisdom of statesmanship to proceed further along this line, to attack other moral evils with the same weapons, and to sweep the whole field of ascertained knowledge in the search for arguments wherewith to enforce such moral instruction?

On the strength of these five arguments the necessity of moral training for the citizen in the public schools is securely established, unless this manifest need can be supplied as well from some other source. To break the force of these arguments, however, it is claimed that the family and the church are the proper agencies for the moral training of children, and that the training received at their hands is sufficient for the needs of the state.

It is freely granted that the family is under a grave responsibility for the moral training of its children, as is also the church; but since the state, as well as the church

and the family, is an independent and divinely instituted society, has she not her own independent responsibility and her own unquestionable rights? May she do nothing toward the moral training of her own citizens? We have seen, in a previous paragraph, that she cannot avoid this training if she would. She cannot enact laws and punish crime without educating in morals the people who are under these laws. And what she does thus indirectly, has she not the right to do directly in her public schools? If she undertakes the work of education at all, may she not give a complete, well-rounded education, and train the whole man, with all his powers, for her service?

Besides, how many children there are who are destitute of any proper family training, — the children of criminals, of vicious and broken homes, orphan children, and children whose lot is worse than orphanage! How many families there are which have no connection with the church, and whose children receive no training in her Sabbath schools or her sanctuaries! Can the state do nothing to provide against the public danger involved in such facts as these?

Under the American doctrine of the separation of church and state, the state ought not to lean directly on the church for anything which is vital to her life and welfare. If the state is to depend on the church for the moral training of her citizens, then she must depend on all churches alike, on the Mormons with their teaching in favor of polygamy, and on every other so-called church, however nondescript or forbidding, and even on the atheist, whose faith, or want of faith, develops naturally and logically into anarchy. Amid all this confusion has the American nation

no moral code, with adequate sanctions to support it, which she can teach authoritatively to all her future citizens?

The true doctrine is, that the need is so great, and the peril from neglect or failure is so urgent, that all the forms of human society, — the family, the church, and the state, — must work together to supply the need and avert the peril. Each of these is free to do its work without dictation or interference from either of the others. The family and the church will do well if they discharge their own responsibilities. They must not be asked to undertake, in addition, the responsibilities of the state.

The conclusions thus far reached may be compactly stated thus: Public schools are established to prepare the citizens for the duties of citizenship. Right moral character is the chief element in good citizenship; the life and welfare of the nation are dependent upon it. This element cannot be adequately supplied from any other source; therefore the public schools must regard moral training as a principal part of their work.

THE RELIGIOUS DIFFICULTY IN THE UNITED STATES; VARIOUS PROPOSED SOLUTIONS

The religious difficulty in the way of moral training in the public schools arises from the connection of morality with religion. The general moral character of the American people has been determined by the religious ideas which have prevailed among the people. These religious ideas are not the possession of any one church, but are common to all churches, and are shared by multitudes who belong to no church. They include such primary religious tenets as belief

in the being of God; the character of God as infinitely holy, just, loving, and merciful; the moral law as the expression of his will; the certainty of sin's punishment; the coming of a Saviour who died for men, and the offer of forgiveness and of eternal life. These beliefs have made us the kind of people we are: they have molded our individual character, and have given form to our laws and other institutions. If we had been a Mohammedan people, all our laws respecting the family would have been different from what they are; so our laws against blasphemy, laws relating to the day of rest, guarding the sacredness of human life, restraining licentiousness, providing for public charities, with many others, would never have been enacted by a people influenced by any other than the Christian religion.

The Christian people of the United States, however, are divided into various churches or sects. These are naturally rivals and are jealous of each other. A large part of the population belong to no church and profess no religion. Hence arises the fear that the state, in teaching morality in the schools, together with the logical basis on which morality rests, may throw the weight of her influence and authority in favor of some one sect to the disadvantage or disparagement of the others.

The fear is natural. It is based largely upon the wrongs, oppressions, and cruelties which have been perpetrated in other lands and in other days in behalf of churches "established" by the civil power. The American people will not lightly surrender their religious liberties, purchased with a great price, or allow themselves to be "entangled again in the yoke of bondage" to ecclesiastical despotism. In all our discussions we must hold this to be common ground on

which all parties stand and which all will equally, and at any cost, defend.

Various solutions of the educational problem have been proposed in order to escape the religious difficulty.

I. The Secular Theory of Public Education

The advocates of this theory say: The American people are agreed as to the importance of intellectual and physical culture, but they are hopelessly divided in their religious opinions. The only possible course of action, therefore, is to put into the schools those things about which they are agreed and to leave out the things about which they differ. Let all religious ideas, even the most elementary, be barred from the schoolroom. Morality may be taught, but only as a system of human conventions, and no argument enforcing it may be drawn from the realm of religion. The evils which are condemned must be condemned because of the injury they bring to man and not because they are sins against God.

To this theory there are several invincible objections: 1. *It does not take into account the religious nature of the child.* Man is not only a moral but a religious being. His moral sense, or his perception of right and wrong, is directly related to his belief in God. Conscience is the sense of duty, but duty implies some one to whom duty is due. If there is no moral governor over man, man's own will is his supreme law. It is difficult to see how there can be any sense of moral obligation in a mind which really denies the being of God. Conscience, or the moral sense, is therefore related to God much as the eye is related to

light. The Christian idea of God is of a being of absolute goodness, immutable truth, unvarying justice, unchanging faithfulness, and perfect love, — as well as of infinite wisdom and power. This God is our Creator, Preserver, and Saviour; we stand in personal relations to him; we love him, and know that he loves us. The reverent and affectionate contemplation of such a being transforms man into his likeness. The sense of his authority, the desire for his favor, the fear of his displeasure, the longing to be at one with him, — these are the most powerful regulative and uplifting forces known to men. These sentiments have made the American people what they are and have made our institutions what they are. They are not the views of any one church or of church people only, but the convictions of the great majority of the American people. Is it wise, or is it necessary, for the state, in laboring to transmit her own character to coming generations, to ignore the chief forces which have wrought in the formation of that character? Is the moral uplifting and guidance of a great nation, numbering already nearly a hundred millions of souls and destined perhaps within a century to include from five hundred to a thousand millions, so light a task that the nation can afford to ignore and neglect the chief instrument for its accomplishment? In endeavoring to impress her own morality upon her future citizens, may the nation make no account of the very soil into which that morality has sent down its roots and from which it has drawn its nourishment?

2. *This theory ignores the moral and religious nature of the state.* The state itself is a moral being, capable of doing right and of doing wrong, and is bound by the moral law. Under the moral government of God nations are punished

for their sins and are rewarded for right character and conduct. A nation defines crime and forbids and punishes it. The questions she must constantly decide are moral questions, questions of peace or war, of justice or oppression, of the moral welfare or corruption of the people. How can the citizen, either a voter or a ruler, decide wisely or rightly such questions as these unless he is possessed of a moral sense and has been trained to exercise it? The man who does not know God and fear him is as incompetent and helpless amid the tasks of citizenship as a navigator who could see neither his compass nor the stars. The bald secular theory of education is the logical correlate of the secular theory of civil government, which is practically political atheism.

3. *Education molded by this theory would not be neutral but would be positively hostile to religion.* The fairness of this proposal is insisted on as its chief recommendation. To banish all religious ideas from the schools, it is claimed, is perfectly fair, and, in fact, is the only fair course as between Roman Catholic and Protestant, Jew and Christian, believer and unbeliever. This is very plausible, but it will not bear examination.

Consider the effect on the mind of a child of a course of school training from which all, even the simplest, religious ideas are excluded. He sees himself one of a vast army which is passing through the schools to be prepared for the duties of citizenship. He sees that the state has made costly provision for this training, — spacious buildings, capable teachers, and all the appliances for thorough and rapid instruction. By all these tokens he perceives that the state is much concerned for his intellectual culture but is

wholly indifferent to his religious character; is resolved that he shall know the rules of grammar and arithmetic but does not care whether he believes in God or knows or believes in the Ten Commandments. What is this but to deny the value of religious truth in the sphere of citizenship; to disparage it in comparison with other branches of knowledge; to deny that the state itself has any relation to God, since the citizen needs no knowledge of God in the discharge of his duties as a citizen? And what is this but positive teaching against religion and a positive lesson in political atheism? And this lesson is given to the child by the state, that majestic personage toward which the child begins to feel the sentiment of loyalty stirring in his bosom, which opens before him the loftiest fields for his ambition and holds before him the great prizes of life as the rewards for his service. What must be the effect of that lesson, reiterated daily through all that plastic period, the school life of the child?

The impossibility of maintaining neutrality regarding religious ideas in the work of education admits of the most vivid illustration. The English-speaking peoples have impressed their religious ideas upon the words of the English tongue. "Right," in morals, as defined by Webster, means "according to the will of God"; and that is but one word out of thousands which have been filled with a religious content by the generations who have created and used our language. What of the words "duty," and "conscience," and "sin," and "God," and "Saviour"? The child must be taught to attach to these words their religious meaning, if he is to understand English literature. He cannot empty these words of their religious significance and then

understand Shakespeare, or Milton, or Tennyson, in passages where these words are found. The same is true of history. American history cannot be taught truthfully without going back to its sources in the great Reformation of the sixteenth century and in the great religious questions which then agitated the souls of men. The government of the school presents the same difficulty. On what ground shall the teacher repress profanity? Because it is wicked, or merely because it is vulgar? And if a child asks, "Why do we have Thanksgiving Day?" the teacher is brought face to face with a body of religious truth which he can neither ignore nor refuse to impart without virtually denying it and teaching its opposite.

4. *The secular programme of education does not meet the needs of the nation.* The nation needs a law-abiding citizenship, a people who will yield obedience to the laws, not merely as a matter of compulsion or to avoid their penalties, but for conscience' sake. To prepare for such obedience, the citizen must not only know the law but must know and approve the reasons which underlie the law. But the main reason which underlies many of our laws is a religious reason; for example, our laws against blasphemy and perjury are based on the reverence due to the name of God. Underneath many other laws, in support of which various reasons may be adduced, there is a religious reason which no candid student of the origin of laws will deny, and which no earnest teacher of the law will wish to ignore. This is true of laws which protect the day of rest and worship, which uphold the authority of parents over their children, which defend the monogamous family and repress licentiousness, and of those which guard the right and the

freedom of the people to worship God. To secure a law-abiding people, in the deeper sense of the word, it is necessary to teach not only the letter of the law but the religious principles in which the roots of these laws are found.

The American people, in devising their system of government, have chosen the oath as the safeguard of the most important interests of society. With the exception of treasurers, who furnish a financial bond, we require no other bond or guaranty from any officer, from the President of the United States down to the village constable, that he will perform faithfully the duties of his office. In our courts of justice, where the most precious interests are constantly drawn into controversy, we suspend all these interests on the efficacy of the oath as a means of searching the mind of witnesses. The word "juror" means, literally, one who swears. Even the soldier may not put on the uniform of his country or lift his hand to defend her flag until he has taken the military oath. But an oath is an appeal to God as witness and judge to deal with him who takes the obligation according as he speaks truly or deals faithfully in the matters to which the oath relates. To a man who does not believe in God the oath is meaningless and useless. The efficacy of the oath is dependent absolutely on the religious knowledge and convictions of the citizen. Washington, in his Farewell Address, insisted on this. "Where," he asked, "is the security for life, or property, or reputation, if the sense of religious obligation should desert the oaths which are the instruments of investigation in courts of justice?" Since, then, the oath is so important an institution in the American government, it follows that no man is prepared for the duties of citizenship unless he understands the nature,

and is capable of feeling the obligation, of an oath. This fitness involves a measure of religious knowledge and certain religious convictions. The secular programme of public education, which would banish these ideas from the schoolroom, does not meet the needs of the nation.

5. *The secular theory of public education is not in harmony with American institutions.* The broad, general, unsectarian principles of religion have been wrought deeply into the framework of the American government. They found expression in the charters and compacts of government in our colonial history ; they appeared as acknowledgments of Almighty God in the constitutions of the thirteen original States, in the Declaration of Independence, and in the Articles of Confederation. Similar acknowledgments are found in the constitutions of almost all our States to-day. These principles have determined many of the established usages of our government, such as prayers in Congress and in our State legislatures and the observance of our national Thanksgiving Day. They have found frequent expression in State papers, especially in times of public danger or calamity. We have already noted their influence in shaping our legislation. And as to our schools themselves, these principles have made our system of public education, generally speaking, Christian and not secular. The correctness of this statement is shown by the fact that in thirty-seven of our States the Bible is generally read in our public schools, — this exercise being in some States required by law, in others upheld by judicial decisions, and in still others by long-established usage and by general public opinion. Of the remaining States, there are five in which decisions of the Supreme Court or of attorneys-general

or superintendents of education have been rendered against the use of the Bible, and three from which the use of the Bible in the schools has generally disappeared, although no such decisions have been given against it. In the year 1904 the Commissioner of Education addressed inquiries to all cities containing a population of four thousand and over as to religious exercises in their public schools. Of 1098 cities reporting, 818 reported that the Bible was read and 827 reported that prayer was offered either by the teacher or in concert by the class. These facts, and such as these, are the basis of the memorable decision of the Supreme Court of the United States (February 29, 1892) that "this is a Christian nation." The secular theory of education is, therefore, an attempt to throw our educational system out of harmony with our national character and with the general character of our institutions. A theory so subversive of much that is oldest and best established in our national life cannot be accepted as a solution of the religious difficulty in the work of education.

II. The Parochial School supported from the Public Funds

This is the solution proposed by our Roman Catholic fellow-citizens and by a few smaller bodies. They insist on religion as an indispensable element in all true education, and they claim that since they have established schools to give both secular and religious instruction, and have relieved the state of the burden of educating their children, they ought to receive, for the support of these schools, a share of the whole fund raised by the state for educational purposes.

They make this appeal on the ground of justice and fair play, and they expect it some day to be granted.

There are two reasons which ought to forbid the acceptance of this proposal:

1. The first is, that if state support for ecclesiastical schools be granted to any one church it must necessarily, in time, be granted to all. Other churches would be quick to perceive the sectarian advantages which would lie in the possession of ecclesiastical schools supported out of public funds. Sooner or later our public-school system would be split up into more than a hundred rival sectarian systems, competing for the patronage of the people and actuated by the inevitable jealousies and hatreds which such a situation would evoke. All sects — Spiritualists, Mormons, infidels, and what not — would claim their share of the public funds and would establish their own separate systems of education. The first and chief aim of all these systems would be to make not good citizens but devoted members of their respective sects. All that sense of unity and that power that waits upon concerted action, which have been factors in our splendid educational progress, would disappear, and the noble system of our public education, built up at the cost of so much labor and study and public treasure through successive generations, would perish.

2. Our second argument against the proposed division of the school fund among the sects would be that under such an arrangement the state would really cease to educate and would become a mere taxgatherer, passing over the funds which she would collect to the church to be used in her ecclesiastical schools. It would therefore be a virtual union of church and state. It would be more simple and

consistent for the state to wash her hands of the whole business and leave it to the churches to create and manage their own systems and find the means of their support. That the American people can ever be brought to accept such a proposal, with its obvious and inevitable consequences, does not seem to be possible.

III. That the Public Schools be purely Secular, but be interrupted at Stated Times for Religious Instruction by Ministers, Priests, or Other Religious Teachers

This proposal is made in two forms, — one that the children be gathered into different rooms in the school building for this purpose, and the other that the public schools be closed, say one afternoon in each week, and the children be gathered in their respective churches for religious instruction. That this plan is not only impracticable but rests on faulty and mistaken principles will appear from the following considerations :

1. *This plan would restrict to a single afternoon in the week a work which ought to be continuous.* The effort to form right moral character on the basis of right principles ought to pervade the whole atmosphere of the schoolroom during all the days of the week. It ought to be always present to the mind of the teacher and should influence all his work. The government and discipline of the school should be directed to this end. History, literature, science, all afford lessons conducive to it. The authoritative segregation of moral and religious lessons into a single session, to be given by different instructors, would operate as an

interdict against such instruction from the regular instructors at any other hour.

2. *Under this plan the state would abdicate the most important part of the work of education,* confessing her incompetence or inability to discharge it. The instruction given at this special session would not be civil but ecclesiastical instruction. The state would have no control over it. It would be primarily in the interest of the churches and not of the state, and the authority and influence of the state would not be behind it. If the state has any responsibility for the moral character of her citizens she should frankly recognize that responsibility and endeavor courageously and faithfully to discharge it.

3. *This moral and religious instruction would, consequently, be inefficient.* Attendance would be voluntary, or such as the influence and authority of parents and religious guides could secure. Large numbers of children would not attend at all. The teachers would not be men and women specially and professionally trained for their task, and qualified by the experience and skill which come with continuous service. The elements of authority and system and harmonious cooperation which secure efficiency in the public school would be wholly wanting in these diverse and fragmentary religious schools.

4. This division of the public school into religious groups once a week, to be taught and drilled in their respective creeds and observances by their religious leaders, *would introduce sectarian oppositions and rivalries and jealousies into the schools, to the detriment of the nation.* It would transfer these from the ecclesiastical sphere, where surely they have wrought mischief enough, to the civil sphere,

where they have no business whatever. Instead of teaching our children that there is a common ground in matters of religion and morals on which they can come together as citizens, it would teach them that there is no such ground, that there are no religious ideas which are common to them as citizens of one country and no religious acts or exercises which they can perform together. It would tend to crystallize, and perpetuate, and exaggerate all religious differences, so that not only the church but the nation would be consciously and obviously divided into sects. This proposal is little less offensive and mischievous than the proposal to abolish the public schools and to divide the school funds absolutely among the sects for the support of sectarian schools.

5. *This plan makes no provision for the large class of children whose parents have no connection with any church, and who are in the greatest need of such instruction.*

Thus various proposed solutions of the religious difficulty have been examined. Each one appears to be confronted with insuperable objections. We turn in conclusion to what seems to us to be the true and adequate solution.

THE TRUE AND ADEQUATE SOLUTION

The solution which is proposed in these remaining pages is not perhaps an ideal solution, suited to an ideal state of society. It is offered as a practical and adequate solution of the difficulties which pertain to the situation at the present time in the United States.

This solution, in the presence of which the religious difficulty resolves itself and disappears, may be stated in

these words: Let the State teach in her public schools the system of morality which is embodied in her own laws, with such sanctions as the religious character of the State herself supplies. In so far as the State has a moral character, that character will be found expressed in her laws, and these laws, with the reasons which support them, the State may and ought to teach. It would not be necessary, in compliance with this proposal, to bring cumbrous digests of laws into the schoolroom. There is a broad and plain distinction between laws which deal with moral duties and are designed to cultivate and strengthen moral character, and the great body of laws which relate to other matters. The acceptance of this proposal would, of course, necessitate the preparation of manuals suitable for the purpose, which would be an easy matter. In support of this perfectly intelligible and practical proposal, that the laws of the State and the reasons for them be taught in the public schools, the following arguments are offered:

1. *This proposal is natural and reasonable.* If the primary virtue of the citizen, as a citizen, is obedience to law, how reasonable that the State should direct her educational labors to implanting the law-abiding spirit! This can best be done by teaching in the public schools that system of morals which has been wrought into the laws of the State, and marshaling carefully, and convincingly, the arguments which justify and sustain these laws. The mere teaching of the letter of the law would be of small value. The effort should be to convince every child of the wisdom, justice, necessity, and goodness of every moral law on the statute books of the State; to make him feel that it is an evil and shameful thing to break any one of these laws; and

so to win his intelligent, resolute, and unquestioning loyalty to them all. Since the State proposes to punish the man for violating its laws, to put him to death for murder, to fine and imprison him for other offenses, how reasonable and just it is that the State shall begin with the child, and shall anticipate and neutralize the force of temptation by winning over the judgment and heart and conscience of the child to the side of the law, and anchoring them there by the power of unanswerable arguments! It may be difficult to do this, but surely the reasoning necessary would be no more abstruse than a proposition in geometry or an arithmetical problem. This should be so expressly made the duty of all schools and of all teachers that if any child in after years becomes vicious or criminal the school and the teacher shall consider themselves to have failed with that child. No intellectual capacity which he may have gained, no material success he may afterwards win, should be accepted in atonement for this failure at the one point of supreme importance. Who can estimate the beneficent results which would follow if all the schools of the nation were devoted to the task of teaching and upholding and justifying the great body of just and righteous laws on our statute books?

2. *This teaching would be authoritative, not merely speculative, and would on that account be more effective.* Law is more than an appeal to reason. It is the voice of some competent authority commanding obedience. A father does well to instruct his children in the reasons which justify his commands; but before instruction can begin, and while it is in progress, the father's commands are the expression of his authority.

It is the weakness of most merely ethical teaching in the schoolroom that ethics are presented as mere speculations in the field of morals. Some man's system is taught, while every man has an equal right to a system of his own. The teaching of morals on no higher authority than the arguments of some author is small preparation for a lifetime of obedience to constituted authority. If the State teaches her own laws in her schools, her teaching rests on an authority which is positive and definite, and which will continue over the man as long as he lives.

3. *This moral system would, in American schools, be remarkably full and complete.* The ten all-embracing precepts of the Decalogue have been, in the main, transferred to the law books of the United States. Moreover, the actual prohibitions of the statutes must be interpreted as forbidding, inferentially yet logically, all causes of and incitements to the commission of the crimes prohibited. The laws of the country, too, include the constitutions of the States and the nation as well as our statute laws. The thoughtful teacher will be surprised and delighted to find what a body of material is here afforded for his use. The right of worshiping God, so carefully guarded in every bill of rights, implies the duty of worship. Worship is a sacred and honorable right and duty, protected by the fundamental law of every State in the American Union. The third commandment is embodied in our laws, almost universal, against profanity and blasphemy; the fourth commandment, in the laws touching the Lord's Day, found in all the States save two; the fifth, in the laws which uphold the just authority of parents and provide prisons and reformatories for incorrigibly disobedient children; the sixth, in all laws which

protect human life; the seventh, in the laws which establish and guard the family and repress licentiousness; the eighth, in laws respecting property; the ninth, in laws against false witness and perjury. Besides these there is a body of laws relating to the nature and form of our government and the duties and qualifications of officers, and another body of laws (the expression of that love which is the fulfilling of all law) providing for public charities and forbidding cruelty even to animals. There is hardly any offense against good morals which is not, directly or by plain inference, forbidden by our statutes.

4. *This would, in the United States, as in all the world, allow of appeal to those religious sanctions which provide the highest motives for obedience.* These motives are the holiness, justice, and love of God, his authority over us, gratitude for his benefits, desire for his favor, and fear of his displeasure in the future world as well as in this. These are noble and legitimate motives, and the most efficacious which can be brought to bear upon the human mind; and the state is not reaching beyond her own proper sphere, or introducing into her education ideas which belong to the church, when she appeals to these motives. As Justice Brewer says in the decision of the Supreme Court already quoted:

> Every State constitution contains language which either directly or by clear implication recognizes a profound reverence for religion and an assumption that its influence in all human affairs is essential to the well-being of the community. . . . There is no dissonance in these declarations. There is a universal language pervading them all and having one meaning. They affirm and reaffirm that this is a religious nation. These are not individual sayings, the declarations of private persons. They are organic utterances. They speak the voice of the entire people.

He then quotes many decisions of our courts in which this view is upheld, and passes to a view of the laws, usages, and customs of our government, noting the usual

> form of oath, concluding with an appeal to the Almighty; the custom of opening all legislative assemblies and most conventions with prayer; the prefatory words of all wills, "In the name of God, Amen"; and the laws respecting the observance of the Sabbath, with the general cessation of secular business and the closing of courts, legislatures, and other similar public assemblies on that day. These and many other matters which might be noticed add a volume of unofficial declarations to the mass of organic utterances that this is a Christian nation.[1]

Most of our States have gone farther than California has in embodying Christian principles in their fundamental and statutory laws; but California prefaces her constitution with the words, "Grateful to Almighty God for our freedom," and in her bill of rights declares that "the free exercise and enjoyment of religious profession and worship, without discrimination or preference, shall forever be secured in this State." The utterance of profane or indecent language in the hearing of women and children, in a loud and boisterous manner, is punishable by a fine of two hundred dollars, or imprisonment for ninety days, or both or either, in the discretion of the court. Perjury is to be punished with imprisonment for not less than one or not more than fourteen years. An annual Thanksgiving Day is observed under the proclamation of the governor. These specimens from the laws and governmental usages of California are sufficient basis for appeal in the schools of that State to the highest motives of conduct. The basis will be found to be still broader in most of the other States.

[1] *United States Reports*, CXLIII, 457–471.

There is not in all the world to-day a single government which denies or repudiates the authority of a Supreme Being or the obligation of his moral laws. Cicero, the heathen philosopher, maintained that the state is inherently religious, — *religio haeret in republica*. The universal character which the nations have impressed upon their governments justifies the claim. All that we ask is that the state teach her own laws to her own citizens, together with those moral and religious convictions which have wrought in her own life and have made her laws what they are.

And since these moral laws on our statute books have been derived, actually and historically, from the moral laws of the Holy Scriptures, the Ten Commandments ought to be taught in the schools as the best and most authoritative summary of moral duties known to men or nations. This moral code is accepted by Jews and Christians, Protestants and Catholics alike. There is no moral excellence which is not required, and no moral evil which is not forbidden, in these ten comprehensive precepts. To the vast majority of our people these commandments come as the voice of a personal God, and supply, therefore, the highest conceivable motive for obedience. If there are any who do not so regard them, they will still agree with their fellow-citizens as to the intrinsic excellence and practical value of these great rules of right living which for thousands of years have been regarded as incomparable by the greatest moral teachers of the world. In the deadly conflict with vice and crime which ravage the land like a pestilence, how can we combat these evils in any way so effectually as by carefully and patiently teaching to the young citizens of the whole nation the law which forbids all evil, inculcates

all virtue, and suggests the highest conceivable motives for avoiding the one and practicing the other? As we have generally, and rightly, placed the flag of the country over the schoolhouses of the country as the symbol of the nation's authority and a mute yet eloquent lesson in patriotism, ought we not to place the moral law of God before the eyes of the children as the foundation of law and the true basis of authority?

5. *This would not infringe on the conscientious rights of any citizen, or of any body of citizens.* This proposal, if adopted, would not concede any preference to one church above another, nor give to any church an advantage over others. It would simply be the nation affirming her own character and transmitting that character to coming generations. In doing this the nation exercises her own rights and liberty, while it accords the same rights and liberty to every citizen. No objection can be urged against this course of action which might not, on the same grounds, be urged against the character of the nation and against her laws.

No parent, therefore, could come to the school authorities and say, "I do not believe in what you are teaching to my children and I object to your continuing it." The parent may believe that the earth is flat, not round, or that monarchy is a better form of government than republicanism, or that gambling is an innocent diversion, but he has no right to veto the laws which prohibit gambling or which establish our republican institutions, or the education which the state, in accordance with these laws, may give in the public schools. To any parent so objecting the state can reply: "We recognize your rights as the parent of this child, and we will not interfere with your liberty to

teach him what you believe; but he is also the child of the nation, and the nation has the same rights and the same liberty. If we recognize and protect your rights in your sphere as his parent, you must not seek to abridge or interfere with the equal rights and liberty of the nation acting in her sphere." The same answer, obviously, should be given to any church or churches who would assume to demand that any particular instruction be given in the public schools, or who would object to any teaching which the nation deems it of vital importance that her citizens shall receive.

Moreover, this would only be doing, more formally and explicitly, what the state does in many other ways. In the rotunda of the Capitol at Washington there is a painting of the Embarkation of the Pilgrims, and of John Robinson, their pastor, discoursing to them out of an open Bible. In the capitol of Massachusetts is a painting of John Eliot preaching to the Indians. On the plaza of the city hall in Philadelphia a bronze monument has been placed recently in honor of the Pilgrims, and the statue, of heroic size, holds a volume with the title, "Holy Bible," inscribed upon it. These are historical memorials of the part which religious convictions have played in our national history, and they are also lessons to the whole people, saying, "Be ye what these men were, that ye may serve the nation as these men did." The spirit which would object to similar lessons in our public schools would overthrow every such monument and obliterate every such inscription; would silence prayer in our legislative halls and forbid our judges to invoke God's mercy on the souls of the criminals whom they condemn to death.

6. *Under this plan the schools would keep pace with every step of moral progress made by the nation, and would assist that progress.* As soon as any moral victory was gained in the field of legislation, the new law and the reasons for it would be taught in the schoolroom, securing general obedience to it and providing against its reversal. On the other hand, the schools would be constantly training a body of citizens not only loyally disposed toward all law but capable of and inclined to progress in moral legislation. It would be difficult to see how the conditions of moral improvement through the successive generations of a nation's life could be, by the nation herself, more happily fulfilled. A vision of such a social state must have been before the eye of Abraham Lincoln when he wrote:

> Let reverence for law be taught in schools and colleges, be written in spelling books and primers, be published from pulpits, and proclaimed in legislative houses, and enforced in the courts of justice; in short, let it become the political religion of the nation.

A happy future awaits this nation, and any nation, which shall consecrate her school system mainly to the development and training of the moral character of her citizens. When the nation shall do this we may be sure that other social institutions will not fail to do their share of the common task. The church and the family, each in its own sphere, will teach the truth as God gives it to see the truth, and will wield the authority with which God has clothed it for the promotion of righteousness. And this work will be maintained through successive generations, the nation ever aspiring and striving toward better things, ever seeking to perfect her laws as an instrument for the moral elevation of her people, and ever teaching those laws, and the higher

law from which they are derived, in the schools where she prepares her citizens for the responsibilities of citizenship. But the nation must strive toward this end consciously and of set purpose, not afraid to avow her concern for the moral improvement of her people, and not hesitating to use the religious faith and conviction which have wrought in her own history for the guidance and uplifting of the generations which are coming after.

T. P. Stevenson, D.D.

Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

III

WE are just now in the midst of an apparent deluge of corruption in public affairs. I am inclined to believe that the American people have not become morally degenerate suddenly. It is one of the chief tasks of each generation to withstand the evil it finds in civic, social, and private life. During the Revolutionary period, and again during the Civil War, it was the custom to decry the evil days upon which the nation had come, when greed and selfishness were as pronounced as loyalty and heroism. There is a remarkable constancy and continuity in the quality of the moral life of peoples. The succeeding generations are bound together through imitation, custom, and tradition, just as in physical form and feature they are held by blood heredity. This relative fixedness is a fortunate thing. It means that whatever reform is undertaken, to be worth while it must not be a superficial affair, else it will be simply like a ripple on the surface of a great stream: it must be such a reform as will influence the springs of human conduct. It means, too, that whatever is done that influences in a profound way the hearts and actions of men will be conserved in the lives of coming generations. Our problem is deep as life itself, and must reach out into the ages.

I do not mean to deny that the amount of civic wickedness at present is especially great. It may be due to a fresh infection, like the spread of a contagion. Besides,

the chances for graft and self-seeking in this, as in every transition time, may be unusually numerous. If opportunities help produce a genius, they will also make a villain. But is not the apparently aggravated corruption due largely to the fact that a few strenuous souls have forcefully laid bare the conditions existing below the "surface stream, shallow and light," of our public life? I have noted that if, four miles below a certain city that pours its sewage into a creek, one stirs up the sands in the bottom of the seemingly sparkling water, it is suddenly filled with filth, and the stench is offensive to the nostrils. I suspect that at this time the muck rakers have simply roiled the stream of public life and shown us the threatening facts in human nature that must be the object of our effort.

What shall be done? The muck rakers cannot cure the evil. Numbers of them may rake across the stream until they are old and gray, but if it receives impurities from above, their work is relatively useless. We must control the sources, just as cities are learning to control the springs and streamlets above their water supply, rather than labor so assiduously to purify polluted rivers. We must spend not less effort in the reformation of present wickedness, but far greater effort in perfecting human lives.

Moral training must begin with the children. Hence it is that the question is one of supreme importance to the school. Hence, too, the importance of the state assuming control of the education of the children as early in their lives as practicable. The home and the state must remain correlative institutions, but it is the function of the state to bring the school under its jurisdiction. The justification of the kindergarten, I take it, is not so much that the

children are taught specific facts and occupations during the early years, as that the schools may exert a wholesome influence over the lives of the children as early as the third or fourth year. One of the pioneer kindergartners of San Francisco undertook an investigation in which she showed that only an inappreciable per cent of the young men of the city who had attended kindergarten had been subject to arrest for misdemeanors, although the kindergartens had been established in the slum districts as missionary enterprises, and in communities in which the per cent of arrests in the total population was considerable. It is fair to assume that the difference was due to a taste of a higher type of life and a sense of social responsibility that were made possible from contact with refined teachers and in the community life of the school. Such enterprises have a leverage upon society that is entirely incommensurate with any effort that might be exerted during later years.

It is next to impossible to reform an old experienced sinner, a political traitor, or a social grafter of three-score years. His spinal cord is thoroughly organized around evil, and all the atoms of his being play in tune to unworthy impulses. To make him over into a righteous citizen is about as impossible as to hope to harvest luscious fruit from a gnarled and blasted tree. Nothing short of fire, in this world or the next, will purge him; and when the purging is done, there is left no more of good than is to be found in a little child, and that without promise of a rich and beautiful future. The one great hope of social evolution is in beginning afresh with each new generation of children.

In still another way we must purify the sources of the moral life. Moral training will be efficient in so far as it

influences the instincts, motives, tastes, and aspirations of children, and not in so far as it tries to inculcate in their minds ideas of right and wrong. Our schools should have not less ethical instruction, but higher moral impulsions. These are the deeper sources of conduct. There has been no little anxiety of late lest, in the absence of a definite attempt to instill ethical ideas, the school should cease to be a character-building institution. I do not believe the anxiety is well founded. On the contrary, it seems to me that the neglect of so-called ethical instruction is a fortunate thing, if only it disturbs us into an appreciation of the more fundamental considerations involved in the situation.

I have observed "morals" being taught in different parts of our own country, and have seen, to some extent, the process going on in two or three other countries, and I confess the cases are few, and stand out chiefly by way of exception, in which there is any perceptible spiritual carrying power in the attempts. They usually degenerate into the teaching of facts *about* conduct, — an almost purely intellectualizing process. It is more common to find the sort of genuine appreciation, of heart response, that has value for morality, in some of the ordinary subjects, such as history, literature, nature study, and art, than in the study of morals itself. The instruction is too formal. There is no particular difference in value to the spiritual development of children between purely factual instruction in arithmetic or in secular history and that in morals. Sometimes the instruction is vapid and lacking in the quality of genuineness. A living response to good and beautiful things does not come on demand, but more frequently at the point where it is least expected. With the

prevailing rule-of-thumb methods, perfunctoriness, heartlessness, and externality in the matter of moral instruction, I do not believe that it would be any great calamity if we had none of it.

Whether the statement be true or false, I am going to assume — for the sake of having the point at issue clearly before our minds — that all teaching of morals be excluded from the schools, and then ask to what extent the power of an earnest teacher need be hampered in promoting the moral development of her pupils? My own conviction is that her efficiency in this direction need not be lessened materially, and that the result would be a gain, provided that she had been supposing that character formation depends largely upon the brief period given to moral instruction.

Ethical teaching should form no insignificant part of the course of study, especially during the later years of the common school, and I shall revert in the sequel to a few suggestions in regard to the kind and amount of such teaching in the curriculum; but I wish chiefly to raise the question in regard to what can be done in the schools, without formal ethical instruction, to arouse the moral impulses that predetermine character.

I would suggest a revision along at least five lines, one of which has reference to the teacher, the second to the pupils' surroundings, the third to the teacher's methods and to the curriculum, the fourth to our conceptions about morality, and the fifth to the nature of children. The end in view is to portray, however imperfectly, the possibility of a school the whole of which shall, in detail and in its entirety, contribute, either directly or indirectly, to the

formation of character. In these suggestions there is nothing visionary; for they are only the simple statement of what I have found suggested in the actual experience of good teachers.

I. The ordinary secular school will be primarily a character-building institution if the teacher is profoundly moral, — cheerful, natural, livable and busy, to be sure, but having in the midst of it all an emancipated spirit that lives behind the words, speaks through the actions, lends color and quality to the thoughts, and breathes life and health into the atmosphere of the entire school.

We are coming to know as never before that there is nothing — motive, impulse, thought, aspiration — that is not finding expression in the tone and quality of the whole personality. Physiologists and psychologists are showing constantly that every idea or state of feeling registers itself definitely and in an all-pervasive way, though very minutely, in pulse beat, nerve tension, and muscular reaction. This kind of fact is becoming so simple and so demonstrably true that every one can understand it and no one can doubt it. It is a fact so important in understanding how the mental life behaves that all persons should take account of it.

It was shown a few years ago by an Italian physiologist (Mosso) that one can think no thought, entertain no feeling or motive however slight, without the circulatory system being influenced in at least four ways; namely, in pulse rate, quality of heart beat, blood pressure, and distribution of the blood over the body. Corresponding changes occur in the respiration, glandular condition, and in muscular tension. His experiment, which is now performed in all

the laboratories, requires a delicate apparatus for magnifying the kinds of bodily expressions that are taking place, most of which are of such a minute kind that no one could be conscious of their presence except as shown in the registration of the apparatus. Another student, Professor Sanford, has demonstrated, with delicate instruments for magnifying the movements of the larynx, that that organ moves almost as perceptibly during silent reading as during whispering. The presence of these delicate modes of expression has been shown in the laboratories in very many ways.

The experimentation but proves what we tacitly admit when we accept the evidence of the handwriting expert, or claim that the inner life of a friend is betrayed somehow in such features and modes of expression as we cannot at all describe if we are asked to do so. There is nothing going on in the life of a teacher that does not find its fitting modes of expression, most of which are of such a subtle character that we are apt to describe them by some indefinable term such as "personality" or "individuality."

The further question arises, "Do these subtle manifestations of the deeper life of the teacher pass over into the minds and hearts of her pupils?" As to a positive answer to this question we can no longer remain in doubt. It is amply proved in our laboratories that our minds are influenced by little elements in our experience so minute that we cannot perceive them, no matter how much we try.

For instance, Mr. Brückner, in experimenting upon touch, has found that if two imperceptible weights—each, say, eleven grains—are applied to some distant points on the

skin, they together can be perceived. Zero added to zero should give zero, but as a matter of fact it gives to the mental life a definite impression. Professor Jastrow and Professor Pierce performed an experiment like this : Two bright plates of small difference of degree of illumination were shown for an instantaneous time from behind a screen. To a person sitting in front the difference in the degree of illumination was so slight, and the time of exposure so short, that it was impossible to tell which was the brighter plate ; but each time he must guess which was the brighter. Had the imperceptible difference had no value to the mind, the guesses in the long run, just like heads and tails of a penny, should have been approximately fifty per cent right and fifty per cent wrong. But the guesses piled up on the side of the right judgment, — that is, the mind can be influenced by imperceptible impressions.

The fact that we are getting definite results for our mental lives out of infinitesimal impressions is demonstrated by experiments on almost all of the senses. Even more convincing in showing the extreme sensitivity of the mind is the work of Mosso [1] and many other persons upon the quality of the responses that occur during sleep. If the person is sleeping upon a finely balanced platform and a slight sound strikes the ear or a most delicate touch is applied to the skin, the head end of the platform swings downward, showing an increase of blood to the head, which is one of the conditions of increased mental activity. The person sleeps on, but still his organism has responded to the stimulus ; and we know that every such response of the body tends to influence our mental states and processes.

[1] *Fear*, pp. 97 ff.

Such results as these have led one of our physiologists to say that the mind is like a wind-swept lake, which is eternally being influenced by the winds of experience.[1]

Thus it is that everything that is going on in the life of a teacher, which finds its expression in the quality of her personality, is filtering and seeping into the lives of her pupils. She can in reality hide nothing. Whatever she is in the depth of her life is forming a part of the atmosphere of the school, and this atmosphere is in turn forming unconsciously the lives of her pupils, in the same way that the air, sunshine, moisture, and elements of the soil are feeding the life of the plant.

Thus it is coming to be demonstrably true that out of the heart are the issues of life. There is nothing more pervasive than character. Morality is as catching as wildfire; it is as contagious as disease, or as sin. We know all this, after a fashion, but shall not have appreciated it at its full worth until the best, maturest, and largest-spirited men and women are secured and retained in the teaching profession.

There was a time in a far-away country, long ago, when only the sages were teachers, — men who, after their period of activity in social and political matters, had gone apart to "solve the divine mystery," and who then came back to their own as wise men and prophets, and taught the children in twos and threes. We stand now at the opposite extreme, when our teachers of children range in age from sixteen to the unspeakable age of thirty or thirty-five. There is a

[1] A grouping of many facts of this kind is to be found in Stratton, *Experimental Psychology and Culture*, Chaps. IV and V, and in Jastrow, *The Sub-Conscious*.

little something in the old Hindoo custom that we may take rather seriously. It is impossible for a teacher to teach what she has n't got down deep within her heart. It is as impossible for her to have a devout nature and keep it hidden beneath the routine of the school day as it is to pollute a spring of pure water, or quench a fire by throwing fagots upon it.

This is the consideration of first importance. With the right teacher, alive in mind and pure in heart, the question of keeping the flame of morality burning while the necessary tasks of the school day are performed will solve itself. To secure the proper teachers is in part a matter of selection, and in part a problem to be solved along the line suggested above: aspiration toward the higher life is a step in its own realization. If teachers felt their responsibility and their need, and would pray often and earnestly the prayer of Socrates, "Ye gods, make me beautiful within," the prayer would be answered by the very act of uttering it. The beauty of the life within would find its way into the hearts of their pupils and become a part of the glory of humanity.

II. The second line along which we may expect improvement in making the whole school life contribute to character is in a measure the counterpart of the last. The surroundings of the child must be made as perfect as possible. Everything about him is food by which he grows. His mental life is hungry for impressions. His passion for play, his curiosity, his inquisitiveness, his courting of danger, show his instinctive need of experiences. What use he makes of the things about him is determined somewhat by the hereditary characteristics which condition his

mental activity. It is determined also, in part, by what is present in his environment.

We know that the things about him are influencing him when his attention is not fixed upon them, and even when they would escape his attention entirely if he should try to perceive them. This was shown under the last topic. Enough facts to demonstrate its truth could be enumerated to use our entire space. It is so important a consideration that I shall emphasize it by one other illustration. Hansen and Lehmann have shown that if two persons are sitting at the two foci of large concave reflectors placed opposite each other so that any sound made at one focus will have its vibrations collected at the other focus, the involuntary movements of speech when one is thinking intently of an idea will be sufficient to transmit to the other person's ear and mind the corresponding idea.[1] But the one person cannot perceive the presence of the laryngeal movements, nor the other the distinct auditory impressions by which he gets the idea.

The fact cannot longer be taken with indifference that the mental life is marvelously sensitive, and that it drinks in continually, and reacts upon, and grows by, the impressions it receives from without. This is the condition back of imitation and custom, and makes clear why they are such powerful factors in society. It is the condition also back of "social heredity," which is no less important than blood heredity in making the race like a long-lived individual. From earliest babyhood the child's mental life is assimilating, polyp-like, the mental stuff about it. It is not to be wondered at that Jukes babies grow up to be

[1] See Scripture, *New Psychology*, pp. 63 ff., 239.

L OF C.

slovenly and immoral like their parents, nor that the offspring of the Jonathan Edwards family should lead lives of high respectability.

The matter of environment may well be taken more seriously than it is at present. The school grounds must be made right. Outbuildings carelessly constructed or in too close proximity and left without supervision may ten times outweigh the lessons in decency that the teacher is able to give during school hours. In one at least of our cities the school authorities are working toward having two closets at opposite ends of each floor, to which the pupils may revert briefly and singly. The playgrounds should have sufficient oversight so that obscenity and vulgarity, to which children in groups turn instinctively, and which are rampant especially in city and village schools, may be minimized until more refining influences can get in their work of preformation. The physical appointments of the school should be pleasing and uplifting. Flower beds, grass plots, scrupulous cleanliness in doors and out, pleasing tints and harmonies of color, artistic furnishing, graceful architecture, well-selected pictures, refinements of speech and dress and movements, — these are the silent but all-powerful harbingers of the higher life, and get in their work during every hour of the day.

We have a doctrine that the child must meet the world as it is and grow strong by resisting its evil. Like every other doctrine it is true up to a certain point, but taken singly is mischievous. A tree grows strong by resisting the winds, and strikes its roots deep during a drought; but a gardener knows enough to protect for a while the tender sproutlet of a tree against drought and accident. If it is

exposed too soon to the ravages of insects and the scurrying feet of children and pets, its experience may work its ruin and not its profit. It is a complex and delicate process for a human being to thread the normal course from babyhood to maturity. Clouston, who spent his life studying physical and mental abnormality, remarks that it is almost a miracle if, in so few brief years, the individual can pass safely along the path over which the race has come through so many ages of failure and success.

III. The third point of revision has reference to the things to be taught and the method of teaching them. How can a teacher do it all and keep from getting lost in the thousand petty details of school life and the countless things she is expected to teach? She can't; nor should she try. Part of the routine of the school, or her own life, will have to be sacrificed, and in the dilemma she had better save her own soul and the souls of her pupils.

It is a long and a sad story how we have mistaken means for ends in education, and are making a great point of mastering the tools of knowledge, instead of concerning ourselves about wisdom. We teach how to read, instead of reading; how to draw, instead of drawing; how to cipher, instead of doing the actual thing that ciphering will help us to accomplish; and so on. It is as great folly as if a carpenter should busy himself all his life making tools, and then get an inkling at the end that he might have made something worth while with them. A safe rule might be, *teach only that which has some real life significance*, both at the time it is being learned and for later life. Learning merely for the sake of learning is rarely, if ever,

excusable ; but of learning for the sake of appreciating and enjoying and growing, we can never get too much.

Here, I am inclined to believe, the fault is as much with the teacher as with the curriculum. In following the rule suggested above there is not so much in the school that must of necessity be excluded. The most formal, meaningless subject, under one teacher's presentation, will, in the hands of a real teacher, be suffused with life significance.

I have seen a class in geometry — after some weeks of interpretation of what proofs in general, and geometric proofs in particular, are, of what relation the subject has to the rest of our thought life, and what its meaning is to the actual interests of men — become so enthused with the subject that occasionally, after some especially neat, clean-cut demonstration of a difficult problem, it would break out in applause as spontaneously as if the demonstration had been the rendering of some work of art, — which it really was. I have seen reading lessons which were purely formal exercises in enunciation, inflection, and pronunciation, serve, even with tiny pupils, as a means of entering into something true or beautiful, and therefore enjoyable.

We should think twice before tearing out any of the pieces from our educational structure. They have served or are serving some purpose. Everybody is wiser than anybody, and our customs are the best wisdom of a large number of people put into practice. But we cannot doubt that formalism has become a dead weight that the schools cannot afford to carry, that the formal and disciplinary subjects have usurped an inexcusably large share of the place which should be occupied by the cultural, and that the school has become a sort of monastic institution, rather

far removed from the real occupations of common life. Schools should deal more with real life situations.

What is the connection between a live school and morality? Their union is in the person whose heart and mind are the theater for both. There is no kinship between the livest of live things, which is a genuine moral impulse, and the deadest of dead things, which much of the round of school occupations sometimes is, — except by way of opposition. The real relation will be apparent later as we discuss morality as a heartful response to ends and ideals that seem worth while.

IV. The next consideration has to do with our interpretation of this thing we speak of so loosely as morality. It means a variety of things, all the way from the most intellectualized notions about duty to the deepest springs of feeling and conduct. My appeal would be that we read it out more than we do in terms of life — life at its growing points, the life of each in relation to all and in relation to his highest sense of reality — and in terms of the spirit one carries into these relations. It is this for which every great educational reformer has stood. I have been profoundly impressed, during recent months, in trying to figure out, as dispassionately as I could, from the Sermon on the Mount and the parables and sayings of Christ, what his "doctrines" of ethics were. He lives and speaks with a higher authority than reason. Instead of a system of ethics, one finds the cup of cold water, a warm, loving heart, and a clear vision that could see the great truths of life reflected in growing seeds and plants and in working men and innocent children. If the teachers of children could only catch the spirit of morality, above its facts and

principles, the school might easily become, as it deserves to be, the greatest agency for the moral regeneration of society.

The question arises how, without continually having the mind of the child alert about the whys and wherefores of conduct, is he to be able to judge his actions? How is he to learn to guide his course without a reasoned system of ethics? He should, in later years, acquire such a system; but I must insist that even then his ethical judgments must remain undefined, though not indefinite. It is the ever-recurring temptation, bred of inertia, to split up and dissect and define and classify the things that belong primarily to our appreciation or spiritual apprehension, that gets us into trouble. We know some things with our *hearts* better than we can ever know them with our minds, and the values we place upon conduct belong among them. I do not know why I love my friend, nor exactly what I get out of the Fifth Symphony or the Sistine Madonna, but I go on drawing life from them in spite of the failure of my intellect to analyze them.

There are, however, a few specific characteristics of morality upon which we can agree, and which the schools may well cultivate by way of preparing the soil and sowing the seeds of the higher life. Without trying to be exhaustive, let us note a few of these, which seem to be at the same time basal elements in morality and good points in pedagogy.

1. In the first place, there is the *power to enter feelingly into some thought interest or into some occupation.* The non-moral and the immoral person alike are creatures who do what they are made to do. They are compelled instead of impelled. When the restraint is off they fall. Arnold's

definition, "Religion is morality touched with emotion," is doubtless very faulty, but it is among the best of the angular snap shots of the actual religious life of those who stand historically as the great spiritual leaders; and a paraphrase of it, by slipping into it the word "education" instead of "religion," would be a good characterization of the ideals of the great educational reformers. In all the list of studies and occupations in the school there are only two — writing and spelling — in which I cannot recall some teacher or teachers who arouse such a happy, heartful response as to give them ethical and even spiritual significance.

2. It is important, too, to morality to do the deed and *live the life whole-heartedly*. It takes in the entire personality. In this respect morality is akin to religion. It is the response of the whole life to its fullest sense of worthwhileness. This attitude can be cultivated in the schools. In so far as there is good teaching, it will be. I saw a teacher recently teaching reading (she called it reading, but it was also expression, dramatization, and a deal more) with a lesson on the classic, "The Three Bears." The children were entirely lost in the story and the situation, and did the acting of the play in that masterful way that is given only to little children and great artists to do. Sometime these little ones might become good, noble lives in society. I saw last summer another teacher, excellently trained, who went into a school which had been priding itself on its thoroughness in discipline. It was days and even weeks before she could get from those fourth-grade pupils anything but a mechanical Yes and No. These pupils had acquired habits of life that were tending to make morality impossible. Our schools, with their choppiness and mechanization are

instilling spot knowledge. They are fixing the habit of responding to little things in little ways, instead of responding to little things (if there are any) in a great way, or to great things with a whole life. In so far as this goes on and becomes an habitual reaction of the pupils, it is making useful and beautiful citizenship an improbability, and even an impossibility unless it be developed by outside influences and agencies in spite of the common school.

3. A third element of morality and of good training is the habit of *responsiveness*. To be alive to the tasks that are set, to the teacher's wish, and to the facts that lie about, is the condition of a good student; to respond to persons and institutions and social forces is a primary requisite of morality, just as social and civic callousness is the primary root of evil and vice. Responsiveness to the thoughts and sentiments of persons and books, to personal ideals and to instinctive promptings, is one of the primary conditions of morality. And responsiveness is a habit that can be cultivated. Through variety in its exercise the habit may pass over into a mood. I do not know much about the doctrine of "formal discipline," — how the training of one habit or power will cultivate another; whether there is a close connection, for example, between making a square box and doing the square deed. I have experimented not a little upon it, and am led in the direction of doubt of it. But of this one can be certain: the teacher herself may widen the spirit involved in any habit or idea until it passes over into related habits and ideas, and becomes finally a persistent attitude. Here we have the responsibility falling back upon the teacher again as to whether the manifold habits of responsiveness, for the varied exercise of which

the school is so full, shall break over into the highest reaches of morality.

4. The most central fact in morality is the *adjustment of the individual to the other person and to the social group.* It is no accident of language that ethical terms, like "duty," "ethics," and "morality," have this idea bound up in them. Just as adjustment to man's physical environment is the source of business enterprise, and adjustment to his sense of a higher reality is the central fact in religion, so his adjustment to persons is the heart of morality. There is no institution — not even the home — that is better adapted than the school to cultivate so-called responsiveness. If this were its sole purpose, the school would be justified. With its larger number of individuals than the home, but still few enough so that the child can feel himself a part of it, the school life is a natural transition stage from the family to the greater life of society.

It is by mingling with others, by actually facing for himself the difficult situations which arise, that the child's character is formed. Some sort of a social sense may arise as the outcome of heredity and instinct; without the interplay of social forces his moral life is sure to be poorly organized and inefficient. It is in the intense heat of this interplay that character is forged. What he can do, the results that he can achieve among his fellows, is the measure of his own will, and the tension and quality of his will are the measure to himself of his own personality. His sense of himself and of his moral responsibility is a reflection of his recognition of other persons and of a higher law behind them which controls their actions. It is idle to suppose, as James Mark Baldwin has so well shown in his *Social and*

Ethical Interpretations,[1] that either a forceful personal will or the recognition of a social order can develop independently of each other. It is in the normal interplay of the two that there arises the sense of duty, obligation, justice, honor, sympathy, respect for authority, and all the rest. The school, bringing as it does each child into intimate relations with many others, is a garden in which these virtues can flourish.

I would make an appeal, however, for a reform in school life in the direction of the *naturalness of the social relations that obtain in it.* They are too artificial. Such conditions as the children are to meet in mature life do not obtain in the school. The most conservative are free to admit that we should advance many strides in the direction advocated by John Dewey in his *School and Society.* There must be normal interaction of the life of each and all, including that of the teacher. The introduction of manual training, object teaching, and physical culture are not enough to save the day. The children should enter, in childlike ways to be sure, into all the occupations they will observe and engage in as adults. There should be not less authority of the teacher, but more, — more, because, being less mechanical, it has the power of nature and society within it. In like manner the school is in need of more order; but it should be order of a kind that springs up in the natural give and take among the pupils, and in the inhibitions that the wishes and conduct of each place upon the others. Something approaching the quality of the life that is found in the family should obtain, at the sacrifice of the military ideals which now pervade the school.

[1] *Mental Development: Social and Ethical Interpretations.*

There is scarcely a latent power in the child's nature that is not daily stimulated with a teacher that is authoritative and companionable, and with the group of other children, — children differing in age, taste, and temperament. With the common life expressed in the games and occupations, he is getting exactly the lessons he needs to learn for citizenship: when passionate, he learns self-control; when selfish, he is given a sure harvest of unhappiness; when obstinate, he feels himself growing aloof from his fellows; and when disrespectful of authority, he feels the sting of social disapproval. And best of all, with the knocks he receives, and also with the pleasures from intermingling with others, society is becoming to him a reality and not a fine fancy. Its absolute demands on him and his responsibility to it become real facts that he can no more ignore or slight than he can deny the fact of his own being. And this is what society needs, — men and women who cannot talk glibly on solidarity, and then ignore the duties nearest at hand; who cannot build Utopias and spin theories of social equality, and then be arbitrary and inconsiderate to the maid in the kitchen, the servant in the garden, and the poor in the streets.

The socially unfit are those who have met the difficult situations of life and failed in adjustment, just as the socially and politically successful are those who can respond in a large way to a large number of persons. Real training for life consists in acquiring the power of tactful adjustment almost momentarily to that indefinable something called public sentiment, — a fact so conflicting and intricate that its elements cannot be determined intellectually, but must be felt by a sort of refined sensitivity. Every hour of the

school life should be rich in its training in this power of refined adjustment.

A word should be said in passing about the matter of discipline. We as Americans are proverbially lax in our rigidness in discipline in the home and in the school. This distinction we have won is our clear gain if it means that a higher kind of authority is prevailing in our homes than that of the imperiousness of our Anglo-Saxon forefathers. Our professors are not so august, our preachers not so terrible, our teachers not so awe-inspiring nor our obedience so groveling as in older times and countries. Still our authority and obedience, if we are to flourish, must be no less real. The one indispensable thing in our relation of teacher and child is companionship. The natural fruits of autocracy, whether in Russia or in the American school, are unhappiness, friction, waste, disobedience, and underhandedness. If the teacher has not authority which springs from greater knowledge, superior advantages, and spiritual worth, she cannot gain it by any arbitrary method. And if she possesses the authority of a higher kind, its presence is sure to be felt.

I do not believe the time should come when the pupil will not feel the danger of punishment of the severest sort being administered, nor do I believe that it is either possible or expedient that authority that seems arbitrary to the pupil himself should not be occasionally visited upon him. It is true to life, and a part of good training, that pupils should often feel, to use the words of Felix Adler, the full majesty of the moral law. This authority, which seems arbitrary to the pupil but really is not, should be a lessening quantity with the advancing years of his life. There is

certain to come a time in his development when external authority must break down and give place to an inner authority, if the boy is to become a strong man. The occasion for the break should never arise. The youth's independence is not something given him out of hand when he reaches the age of twenty-one, but a natural right, in the exercise of which he should be schooled from earliest boyhood.

5. The pupil should come to *feel his own life and truth as part of a larger life and truth.* Almost every normal human being must sooner or later undergo a sort of Copernican revolution in his life, by which the center of gravity is transferred from himself to "society" or to the "universe." Otherwise his stupendous stock of self-regard, which at one time in the course of evolution was normal, is dragged up into the present and renders healthy social relations difficult or impossible.

One of the ways of approach to this transference of the center of interest is in the *cultivation and right use of the imagination*, by which the person can transcend his own narrow limitations and make real in thought and feeling the world of people and things outside. It has often been observed, and truly, that the primary sin of selfishness is due to an inability to live in imagination the lives of others. Slavery to a finished and finite truth and to a narrowly circumscribed world, true only as external thing, or as subjective sensation, is the result of a blunted imagination. Fairy story, fable and novel, history, civil government, biology, and sociology, the community life of the school, can open up to each child a real world of people and a universe of which he is a part. The inevitable outcome of

a right use of nature study, geography, science, history, and astronomy, is to picture progressively a world infinitely extended in time and space, changeless in its basal qualities, and on which the person is entirely dependent. The natural fruit of such studies is a spirit of humility and reverence. A whole-hearted responsiveness to persons and to the highest object of reverence is that in which both morality and religion consist.

Another approach to this important result is through cultivating a longing for and a delight in the thing that lies just next. In its higher aspects it is the truth-seeking and truth-loving spirit. With little children the thing that lies just beyond will be a little thing. Even then, under the guidance of a real teacher, the facts will sparkle with a larger meaning. There are no facts but have leading strings to them, inviting us away to some holy of holies, if only an illuminated mind is brought to bear upon them.

We are too fond, however, of what might be called intellectual *mechanics*, as opposed to intellectual *tastes*. We pay out to our pupils carefully enumerated pilules of knowledge. The excessive analysis, and dissecting, and hair-splitting, and logic-chopping, into which our school life has tended to degenerate, defeat the ends of intellectual training itself and of scientific procedure. The men who have made scientific discoveries, who have led the world onward in matters of intellectual insight, have not done so simply because they possessed keen intellects, but even more because they have become enthused and intoxicated over truth. What we attribute to mental acumen alone is due quite as much to a process of mental digestion and assimilation on the part of those who have a longing and a

thirsting after outlying truth, with which they have a warm sense of intimate relationship.

6. The next element of morality, and also of good teaching, will seem at first to contradict the one last discussed. It has reference to the importance of *learning to see things accurately*. Felix Adler has well observed in his *Moral Instruction of Children* that there is an intimate relation existing between the study of mathematics and science, and veracity and integrity. One of the highest ends of learning is to make neat and accurate distinctions in places where hitherto there have been only confusion and obscurity. Morality gains for itself a solid framework when one learns that its laws are fixed in the solid structure of the universe and cannot be distorted or twisted by freaks of impulse or by a selfish act of will. The exact sciences, and all the subjects that depend upon exact relationships, are the best schooling for this conception of the moral law. The child soon learns, and the facts must be impressed upon him and occasionally called out explicitly, that two and two are four, and cannot be anything else; that a straight line is the shortest distance between two points, and that by no turning and twisting can he make it otherwise; that two parts of hydrogen and one of oxygen properly combined must form water or nothing; and so on indefinitely. These conceptions of the fixedness and finality of certain relationships, which are absolutely indispensable conditions of right thinking and right living, are not, however, truth, but tools by which we attain and use truth. The truth-loving and truth-seeking spirit above referred to continually reaches out beyond these specific relationships to that which they suggest. As we are getting freed

from over-intellectualism in our conception of life, it is becoming clear that truth is a growing and not a static something. It is organic as the human body is organic, and not a mere machine.

The habit of seeing things accurately and getting definite notions may be cultivated not only in mathematics and the exact sciences, but also in a careful use of words, phrases, proverbs, and maxims. Professor James has rightfully and forcefully pointed out in his *Talks to Teachers* the connection between the right naming of things and right conduct. To dub drunkenness by its old familiar, disgraceful name, instead of disguising it by some graceful term like "conviviality"; to call a willful act of evading a fact "lying," and to feel the prick of its sting; to attach the name of "robbery" to the kind of grafting that is apt to pass under the title of "lively enterprise," and allow the evil doer to swelter under the opprobrium, — nothing can be more forceful in guiding the moral life along the paths of rectitude. Through repetition and right emphasis a large stock of terms of both approval and disapproval can be so suffused with meaning and become so insistent before the minds of children that they may bring out into bold relief, with all its heights and depths, the field of the moral life. Proverbs, which Professor Palmer designates "packed wisdom," and maxims which embody the condensed experience of the race, may be skillfully used in focalizing the mental life so perfectly that the corresponding acts are well-nigh inevitable.

7. Still another factor in morality that the schools may cultivate to their own profit is the integrity of the personality. Synonyms of immorality are "looseness" and

"distraction." A person says one thing to-day and another to-morrow; he promises a thing and supposes he means it, and without intentional dishonor will later do the contrary. He is at the mercy of shifting circumstances. It is perhaps no accident of speech that the term moral "integrity" means "wholeness." The Roman term "gravitas," which seemed to be equivalent to our term "character," embodied something of the same meaning. The life must be a unit; it must be organized around dominant interests and guiding purposes which make it continuous with itself throughout all the days and in the midst of a changing environment. The moral person is one you can count on. The *Indianapolis News*, of May 19, 1906, says:

> A man convinced and heroically determined to abide by his convictions is a match for a world of doubters and shufflers. Nor is there ever any difficulty in recognizing such a character. It speaks for itself, and draws men by its silent and ceaselessly working power. . . . The steadfast man is the trustworthy man, and it is to him that men invariably turn when the skies are black and the seas are white. Whether the man be a soldier, or a pilot (as old Palinurus, who, in a storm, vowed that no matter what Neptune might do to him he would keep his rudder true), or a statesman, this quality of absolute steadfastness to the task assigned is one of the greatest that can mark men; but, as is usually the case with great qualities, it is rarer than it should be.

The schools can work toward this terse organization of the personality to their own advantage. At the present time they are altogether too kaleidoscopic. From the standpoint of the pupil the day's work must seem to be a patchwork of almost everything. If the materials the child is using are entirely unrelated, the effect is inevitably in the direction of dissociation of his mental life. It is equally

true that if they are well related and thoroughly organized within themselves, they are food for his mental life in the direction of unity and harmony. Whatever the subjects that are taught, they should not only be related more closely to one another, but each subject should have its central ideas and its plot, to which the thought of the child shall revert day after day. In this way the mind of the child may come to have continuity within itself. This point, which involves the entire question of the correlation of studies, is so well presented in C. A. McMurry's volume on *General Method* that I can do no better than refer to it in this connection.

It was one of the great messages of Herbart and Froebel, and many of the reformers since, that the individuality of the child must be respected from the beginning of his education. In no other way can his moral and spiritual life be conserved. It is a message seemingly as little appreciated in our schools generally to-day as at the time when it was so profoundly and clearly set forth.

How will the schools gain by adopting this principle of unity and coördination? They will teach much more if they teach less. The mind, even during early childhood, cannot grasp or retain so easily disconnected material, as that which is related within itself or in tune with its prevailing interests. Our schools are wasting time, year in and year out, dawdling with matter which to the mind of the child is meaningless. There is, on the contrary, hardly a limit to the capacity of the mind to master details that are seized with enthusiasm.

This analysis of the common elements of good education and of morality does not mean to be exhaustive. It is

complete enough, however, to suggest that for the occupations and studies of the school to blossom into a curriculum whose central aim is the development of character should be as natural as for a healthy tree to bear fruit.

V. The last point to consider in spiritualizing the secular schools concerns itself with our understanding of the nature of children; but there is only space for the merest hint. We are being taught nowadays that morality gets its content from the sum of instinctive endowments with which the individual is supplied by nature. Before the person becomes a bundle of habits, he is already a bundle of instincts. The personal life is a spring in which there well up the brute and the human instincts. The sum of these instincts and their particular blending give coloring and quality to the whole life. Indeed, life is little else than the sum of these instincts. They determine personality and character. Along with the growth of memory and self-consciousness they shade into motives, and with the power of foresight they constitute aspirations and ideals. The instincts not only determine character, they determine also our entire thought life. Our systems of belief, our doctrines, our philosophies, are like tents that we carry about with us and pitch over us; they are shifted and reconstructed at will. Or they are like the trellis which the gardener places for the vine,—important enough, to be sure, to a good fruitage,—while the living, growing vine corresponds to our instinctive life. A man's conduct is the outcome of the elemental forces that play through his life, and not the result of his logic. We shall be immensely wiser when we come to appreciate this simple truth. It is the presence of these instincts that gives to

human life its depth and its breadth and its reach. "If the single man plant himself indomitably upon his instincts," said Emerson, "and there abide, the huge world will come round to him." It is the interplay of these elemental endowments that gives to life its struggles, its tragedies, and its successes. Almost all the students of the moral life at the present time are teaching us that the moral instinct itself is the outgrowth of a conflict among the other instincts. The analysis of the moral impulse, indeed, shows that it involves a discord and an attempted readjustment either to one's larger self, or to the social group. It is in the midst of this rupture and the striving toward the higher harmony that the meanings of life are teased out.

> When the fight begins within himself,
> Man's worth something. God stoops over his head,
> Satan looks up between his feet, — both tug —
> He 's left, himself, in the middle. The soul wakes
> And grows.

The highest function of the teacher is to take this germ of possibility, — a little child, — and cultivate its instincts symmetrically. A few of them will have to be repressed and overshadowed by others. Self-regard, for instance, was at one time the highest virtue; it is still a necessary ingredient in virtue, and holds its place both in the Golden Rule and in the Ten Commandments. So far from needing encouragement, however, it is one of the chief functions of both morality and religion to hold it in subjection. Most forms of gross immorality center in excessive self-regard.

Some of the instincts need fostering and stimulating. The most marked examples of this class is the group of

other-regarding impulses, — sympathy, love, coöperation, and self-sacrifice. These have come in rather late in the course of evolution, and are threatened constantly by self-regard. They come relatively late in the life of the individual. Their normal blossoming time is in the teens. The supreme danger that threatens every human being in his moral development is that selfishness will become such a gross, ugly weed that the finer flower of love will never have a chance to flourish. Our schools have not yet fulfilled their true function if pupils have passed through the high-school period without the social sense having become one among their passions.

The chief task with all the instincts is to bring them to the highest degree of refinement, instead of leaving them crass and bestial. This may be done by inhibiting their lower expression, by centering them upon higher objects, and by repressing them by higher forms of expression, — that is, by casting out the evil with the good. Fear may be softened into respect and reverence; curiosity may be tempered into a desire to know; self-regard and self-seeking should ripen into self-respect and the ideal of self-perfection; anger should be suppressed until it becomes resentment and then righteous indignation; self-expression on a purely physiological plane should, as life develops, be refined also into self-expression in art, literature, morals, and religion; love of parents and playmates should pass up into a supreme devotion to all men and love of the Highest; and so on indefinitely. The teacher must be wise enough to use all these instincts of a child. She must suppress this one and that (the method depending upon the particular child with which she is dealing), by watchfulness,

or disapproval, or punishment, or pictures from literature or history of the tragedies of evil; she must nurture certain other instincts by cheerful commendation, by skillfully chosen stories, by poems, by plots from fiction, by examples from the lives of great men. She should be able to play upon the instincts of the child as a musician plays upon the keys of an instrument, and out of them produce a symphony of beauty in which every discord is taken up into a higher harmony.

This paper has purposely disregarded, up to this point, the question of the place of ethical instruction in moral training, for the sake of emphasizing considerations that are more fundamental and at the same time more frequently overlooked. It should, however, be brought out into clear relief, though most briefly, that a teacher who is alive upon the question of character formation will find a place during all the years of school life for specific ethical teaching. In the earliest grades myths, fairy stories, and nature stories will predominate. These will pass over gradually into anecdotes, fables, and stories from history and literature, with their "morals" omitted. By the time the fifth and sixth grades are reached, these may be supplemented by tales and readings about the life of other peoples, with chief reference to their social and moral customs, and by occasional reflections upon our own duties and proprieties. In the seventh and eighth grades, and in the high school, the artistic portrayal of the moral life as set forth in literature, history, and art, should be supplemented by thoughtful considerations upon ethics that naturally arise in connection with these things, and also in civil government, geography, history, and science. Here may well begin also some

systematic study upon duties, personal habits, and social relationships, as presented, for example, in Charles F. Dole's *Citizen and Neighbor*, in W. L. Sheldon's *Duties in the Home*, or in C. C. Everett's *Ethics for Young People*. During the third or fourth year of the high school, which is the people's college, any one of the simpler treatises upon ethics might well be studied for at least one term, even at the risk of crowding out a term of some literary, scientific, or mathematical subject.

It has seemed worth our while to try to set forth in the strongest terms that, during the earliest years, character formation does not come about through definite ethical teaching, but through influencing the deeper sources of life and conduct that lie back of the intellect and perform the quality of the life. It is equally true that the ability to think intelligently upon personal conduct and social relationships should be gradually developed with the dawn of reason, and that it is the right of every citizen, by the time he reaches maturity, to be able, by the help of a wise teacher, to picture to himself the essential lines of our ethical superstructure, and to appreciate for himself its basis in the laws of human life.

Edwin Diller Starbuck

State University of Iowa
Iowa City, Iowa

IV

Frank Cramer

I

TWO things have been permanently settled by the American people: the children of the nation shall be educated in the public schools, and religious instruction shall not be given in those schools. There will doubtless be further discussion, but the drift of public sentiment has been so strong and steady during the last two generations that the general question can hardly be reopened. The reasoning and passion that may hereafter be spent on the subject will probably not seriously affect either the statutes or the public sentiment of the country. The schools have justified themselves, and even if there were no prospect of further valuable improvements in the system, the people would cling to it in preference to any other system of education the world has hitherto tried.

But a wedding does not solve problems; it only creates them. A married man can no longer debate the question whether he shall support his family; the marriage compact settled that; the only consideration is, how he shall fulfill his obligation. In a similar way the time has passed when the public schools can shunt the people's moral problems. The task of furnishing moral stimulus for right living is now squarely before them. There is a steadily growing conviction that the moral nature of the child must be definitely provided for in the public schools. They will

have to prove, by doing it, that sound moral training can be given without direct religious instruction. The field is clear, the people want it, and even the law provides for it, as witness the utterly dead California statute, which says that instruction in morals must be given in all grades and all classes during the entire school course.

Doubtless a large amount of moral stimulus has been incidently injected into the spiritual arteries of our children with the instruments available in our schools, but a thorough understanding of the influence of the schools has not been possible because there is no way to isolate and exhibit the effects produced. There are so many and such powerful and subtle agencies at work on the moral nature of the child that it is impossible to say what part each has played in the formation of his character. If all available resources had been exhausted, the study of actual results would take on a serious aspect; but the problem of moral training in the public schools has not even been seriously attacked. Nothing like a general effort has been made as yet to formulate the requirements that can properly be laid upon the schools, or the materials and methods with which to meet them. We are standing now with our feet in the edge of the water and shivering, like the naked little boy, more from fear than cold, deterred from going back by shame and from going in by the goose-flesh conviction that we shall never be able to do it.

Swimming is best learned by going into deep water. We are still very far from general agreement about what things ought to be taught, how they should be taught, and the order of their teaching, in the purely intellectual work of the schools; but enormous progress has been made. The

right theory is working itself out of actual effort, and the same thing will be true of moral training. The method is yet unformed, and the materials are still miscellaneous and unclassified; but the sooner we get rid of the notion that the problems of morals need to be handled in ways incompatible with the spirit of the public school, and the sooner we realize that the principles underlying moral growth are the same as those underlying intellectual growth, the better it will be for us. After all the unessential accessories have been brushed aside, the greatest gains left to us from recent developments in education are gains in conception and method. When once the people definitely demand that the teaching profession make provision for moral training, and the teachers apply to the task the principles already worked out in the intellectual field, the shivering stage will be passed. One of England's great economic writers once declared that if there should arise a strong demand for prima donnas, the prima donnas would appear. His prediction has come true. A worthy process of moral training in the public schools will emerge out of the necessity for it.

History shows that when a people has become corrupt in both its conduct and its ideals, moral teaching will not save it; nothing but desperate calamity can make a new soil for domestic and social virtue to grow in. And we know now, better than we did two generations ago, that universal education is not a panacea for moral ills: the citizen's ability to read his ballot is no proof that he will not sell his vote; the fountain of knowledge still has the bitter taste of sin; purely intellectual training may only put ashes in the mouths of hungry men. Neither will culture keep or make a people clean: the Italy of the

Renaissance was almost perfectly equipped; wealth was widely distributed, and her upper classes had culture, taste, and leisure, but refinement harmonized with lust. The very intellectual, æsthetic, and commercial qualities that seemed to make her great bore deadly fruit; peace became a moral stench and war a bloodless farce. Pure women and honest men were wanting in those fateful times, and Italy paid the penalty of her moral disintegration with centuries of political agony and social suffering.

But we still have a core of moral soundness. We decline to surrender the old ideals to the morality of shrewdness, and will not give homage to intellectual greatness coupled with moral weakness. We enjoy the orations of Demosthenes, but despise him because his record is befouled by the putrid fact that he was a chronic bribe taker. We admire Webster for his mental power, but he cannot command the homage of the American heart as Washington and Lincoln have it, because when the hour of sacrifice came he sacrificed righteousness instead of personal ambition. The simple-hearted man, with the golden threads of self-sacrifice and heroic rectitude running through his career, is still the American ideal.

History, our own experience, and the sober feeling of our thoughtful people, all warn us that the general welfare depends on integrity and purity, and not on intellectual and commercial power.

II

At the outset, moral training in the schools encounters grave difficulty in the feeling that ethical lessons alone will not solve the people's moral problems. There is in every

civilization a powerful undertow of moral tendency which individuals as such can do little to check or change. The general mind drifts rather than reasons itself toward or away from its problems. The needs, desires, tasks, the reason, feeling, imagination, — all contribute to the creation of a general opinion or common sense, which moves, after the fashion of a solar system, through what might be termed moral space. Within the mass there seems to be nothing but countercurrents of individual purposes, passions, and ambitions. The secular drift goes on for the most part unrecognized. If the public schools are to make any worthy contribution to the moral training of the people, they will have to take into account the great moral drifts of the people as a whole.

One of the most profound changes that has ever come over the spiritual life of civilized men is now working itself out. Its moral significance has been recognized only by thoughtful men. Scientific ways of thinking and working have brought with them the conviction that all things — physical, intellectual, social, political — are subject to law. Under the cold light of this intellectual mood everything seems to lose its old moral significance. Fear of ill and hope of good have both suffered, and reverence has shrunk perceptibly. The tendency has not only touched the cultured, but it has become especially characteristic of the more thoughtful part of the working masses. If the moral training of the schools is to be effective, it will have to use this governing tendency by doing its work on the broad basis of general principles.

Another recent tendency still more seriously threatens to affect our older moral views. The organization of modern

business is along impersonal lines, so that the individual in his business relations is brought more and more into contact with corporations and less and less into contact with the direct personal interests of men. This commercial tendency will warp the Golden Rule as surely as the sun will warp a birchen board. Ordinary dishonesty between man and man will always be rightly judged; but Lamb struck the key to this moral difficulty when he said, in "The Old Margate Hoy," the smuggler "is the only honest thief. He robs nothing but the revenue, — an abstraction I never greatly cared about." The elimination of personality carries with it the temptation to eliminate the moral element. To transfer one of Lecky's figures, the danger from this insidious, corrupting notion does not lie merely in the possibility that corporations may lose some of their property, but that the people may, in spirit at least, become a band of thieves.

The schools can meet this sagging tendency in the foundation of personal honesty in a corporation age only by strengthening the conviction that when an unrighteous thing is done the greatest injury falls upon the doer; by establishing the single, gold standard of morality on the motive of the doer and not on the consequences to the victim. The effect of this commercial tendency will be the more inevitable and irretrievable because it is not an intentional moral influence, but a blind force, sucking the people's morals into its vortex.

In Spain education is probably more nearly useless for the general purposes of life than in any other civilized country, because it runs its own course, without touching the great interests of the people. The real value of a

country's educational system is determined by the degree to which it is adapted to influence helpfully the practical life of the population. There are several noteworthy tendencies in our American life which have been clearly recognized and to a slight extent provided for in the schools. Among the most important is the effect of our methods of business organization on the personal life of the workers. The big stores, factories, and similar institutions have drawn the girls away from home. Even when they live at home while they are wage-earners, they are largely relieved from home duties. The economic drift is tending to make girls less willing and less competent to be home makers. In former days they cooked and sewed from necessity and got some training for motherhood by caring for brothers and sisters. It was a stern training. Although the schools cannot make domestic experts, they can, by giving the elements of domestic science, plant desire and awaken ability along those lines of activity that are most closely related to the moral welfare of the race.

Modern manufacturing methods have strengthened the drift of population from country to city. No nation ever collapsed while it rested on the shoulders of a strong, clean, rural community, and none ever escaped disaster when that part of its population decayed. Our nation's moral reserves are in the country; and if, by the kind of training they give, the schools can help to keep the bright, clean boys and girls on the farms, they can do more for the moral future of our country than by giving direct moral lessons, because there the ideal citizen will grow under conditions best adapted to develop confidence in the world, fair play for others, and a contented spirit. A country

school cannot give an elaborate course in agriculture, but it can give the children the germ of desire to master the complicated science of farming. A few agricultural books, from which a pupil can make an occasional report on special topics, may be the seed of future good to the nation, by making him an ambitious farmer, — a combination thinker, worker, and business man. While that can be done the moral tone of the nation will not be affected by inheritance from the second best.

What has already been said in regard to agriculture and domestic science applies with equal force to manual training. It is more valuable as a moral than as an economic discipline, because it awakens the creative spirit, — the mother of hope. All these lines of training bring the feelings to cluster around things with which it is desirable they should be occupied.

The moral feelings take on the color of a people's environment and occupations as surely as a desert fauna takes on the desert tints.

> While I am a beggar I will rail,
> And say there is no sin but to be rich;
> And, being rich, my virtue then shall be
> To say there is no vice like beggary.

Even the great Protestant churches have not escaped this law. Slavery rent asunder the Methodist and Presbyterian churches as it did the nation. European and Japanese feudal systems developed appropriate moral codes. How could real benevolence be a virtue among the Greeks, where the poor were helpless not merely by stress of circumstances but also by law? Race emotions flutter about the things that seem great to the people,

and things that are least suspected undermine the people's morals more effectively than the vices that are openly recognized. The supposedly innocent old Roman games brutalized the people, and in the end destroyed the capacity for reasonable pleasure. History and reason combine to lay primary stress on the people's occupations as the point at which moral training should begin.

Another tendency that calls aloud for moral training in the public schools, because they are the only institution capable of dealing with it adequately, is the American tendency toward moral precocity. Freedom comes early to the child in America and along with this freedom there is a growing lack of time for moral retirement for the development of moral fiber. One evidence of this is the way in which youth in school and college try to handle adult problems with the morals of childhood. The problem is to make responsibility the yokemate of freedom.

Possibly the most important tendencies are beyond our power to see. There may be among them forces at work for moral good. We know that freedom, in the long run, is among these forces. There is comfort in the fact that evil is more easily seen than good, for the strongest forces for good all work underground. As has been often pointed out, Greek and Roman philosophers knew that their civilizations were rushing to ruin, and were peering anxiously into the future, like a lost child in the deepening twilight, for some sign of direction; but they failed to see the significance of the new power that was to emerge from the ruins of the old world. They poured out their contempt upon Christianity and passed it by. Nations, like men, move in directions unforeseen.

III

Democracy has brought many disappointments, but undreamed-of improvements have also come. An unforeseen feature of our complex system of government — which was elaborated in the interests of freedom and for the safety of the individual — is its development into a maze in which the artful dodger can evade the purpose of the law. This country, far less than any other, can depend on its law to keep it morally sound. Moral resistance of the aggregate against the aggressions of financial and other practically lawless forms of power is the line along which our spiritual development will run. Roosevelt's appeal, in his message of 1905, was a confession that the public conscience must enforce the rules of righteousness. The burden of the schools is to create a spirit of moral team work, a social efficiency, a taste for coöperation. The possibilities of playground government as a moral power have been scarcely dreamed of yet. Experience has shown that large burdens which the arm of school authority has borne can be judiciously laid on the pupils' shoulders.

Most of what has been said points to the notion that sound character results from rightly directed energy rather than from direct resistance to heavy temptation. The moral yearnings of rural communities are due in part to favorable conditions. In the presence of perpetual temptation good intentions wilt like growing grain in a hot Dakota wind. Lecky and others have repeatedly shown that moral inequalities are due more to differences of temptation than to differences of self-control. Temptation and friction are both inevitable consequences of the working of elemental

forces, but the best results come when both are reduced to a minimum. The pine tree on a windy coast is hardy enough, but the biting blasts have made it crooked, small, and ugly. Persistent moral stress in one direction will ruin the moral symmetry of a man or a people. Opportunity is the gate of guilt. If the public schools are ever to become perfectly efficient they will have to guide the feet of the children away from the fields of moral stress. And their work will more and more be seconded by social forces that have no moral intentions; as, for example, expert gunnery in the navy, and the commercial needs of the railroads, are forcing men to be sober. These coercive forces cannot effect the finer forms of virtue based upon good will, but they help lay the foundations for higher things.

In a further special direction the school can, by its outreach, not only wield a strong influence on the community, but increase greatly its moral power over the children. The schools, as constituted, are a great instrument of moral discipline. They must of necessity require order, regularity, promptness, self-control, obedience, quiet, industry; but there is always for the pupil an element of coercion in the situation. The voluntary moral element can be largely increased by interesting the home in the work of the school. This cannot be done by making the teacher a home missionary, but it has been done and can be done by making the school a center of local interest. The people's information about the schools is warped not only by childish malice, but by the inability of the children to report correctly. The criticism which the home returns upon the school is not based upon sound judgment, and the tendency

is to minimize the moral power of the school. The little entertainments, art exhibits, brass bands, glee clubs, please the people more than the work of experts; but the most valuable effect of this class of school activities is to bring the feelings and opinion of the home to reënforce the school on a basis of mutual understanding. The motives for creating such local interest in the schools have been various, but the effect on the schools has always been lasting and good. The possibilities are yet unmeasured. The most hopeful aspect of the people's moral problem is the fact that our faces are turned in the right direction. But we are hardly yet prepared to realize that if the energy of the schools were directed into channels of activity whose usefulness has been fully demonstrated, we should feel a moral glow that is yet unknown.

The function of the public schools is to help fit the children for sound living. This involves the growth of right notions and the formation of right habits. Knowledge, good will, and energy are the three conditions of sound character. Knowledge alone is ineffective; most men know what is right, but many go right on to stain their lives with moral uncleanness. The real problem is, not how to produce moral connoisseurs, but how to make moral artists, with creative energy and impulses. The nature of the moral training is conditioned by the double function of conscience. This distinguishes right and wrong, and punishes the doer of the latter with remorse. At the outset judgment and feeling go together; but while even the worst criminals retain through life the power of moral discrimination, the impairment of moral feeling is a critical danger to which every one is exposed. The gravest task

in moral training is to interweave feeling with judgment so that they may be inseparable.

We are governed less by logic than by common sense, and our feelings constitute a large ingredient of the latter. They cluster round our deepest wants, and reason fails so often because it takes no account of them. Without them convictions are lifeless, intellectual formulas. For one person who leads a calculative life, a thousand are driven along by impulse, and the moral task is to train the feelings away from impulse and link them to permanent ideals; it is the momentary motive that makes the feelings the unsafe guide of life. The head may reach sound conclusions, but if the feelings deal with the picnic things of life, dawdle with the daydreams, there is bound to be spiritual discord; but when the feelings take charge of the conclusions that the intellect has reached, action will follow as surely as pressure upon grapes will make the grape juice flow.

And not only the feelings, but the imagination needs definite training for moral purposes. I do not mean that we as a people need a busier imagination, — for it is already too active, — but that the imagination needs to be provided with solid material to work on. Sin often strikes its first deep roots in daydreams, but, as a rule, sin is marked by a deficient imagination. The criminal world is notoriously defective in this respect. He who lacks imagination has no means of making impressive to himself the things that are distant in time or place. He cannot reach out and think clearly over distant consequences, and so his impulse trots after every temptation, much as a pampas lamb will leave its mother to follow a horse. When once the imagination

is powerfully enlisted in behalf of the doctrine of consequences all the virtues will breathe more freely. The knowledge which the schools have imparted has been so largely verbal that the imagination finds but little to work on. The problem, from our point of view, is that of transforming mere verbal grasp of moral things into something like reality; and we shall see that the only way to make varied and accurate knowledge useful to the imagination is to subject it to the control of general principles. On the other hand, one real experience, like a visit to a police court or a jail, will give the imagination materials for contemplation, — types upon which to model its pictures of things that need to be known but cannot be seen. This contemplation would fill our greatest moral want. There are indications that nations, like men, may suffer nervous prostration or moral collapse if they do not let themselves grow drowsy. What Thoreau said of tired students is good for all of us; we should be better off if we would honestly slumber a fool's allowance. Then there would be a slower and longer waking-up time in which to let the threads of common sense arrange themselves.

Whatever incidental service the school may render to the child's present life, its chief service is intended to be for the child's future good, when the leading strings of the home have been worn thin and those of the school have been cut. Now at least nine tenths of our children leave school at the dawn of adolescence, the most critical period of their lives, when moral guidance is more necessary to them than at any other time between birth and death; when the methods of childhood are becoming obsolete; when responsibility begins, but judgment is immature; when

moral storms tear up the moral growths of childhood and dreams float in the air; when children seem strange to themselves; when they are morally more lonely than ever before or afterwards; when they must not only face the great temptations of life, but make its great decisions without experience; when they least desire others to penetrate their thoughts or mold their judgments. The greatest need of this period is a moral one. What provision do the schools make for it?

It is a fact, recognized in the educational circles of all civilized countries, that during adolescence there is a progressive loss of interest in the things the schools deal with; there is a sense of escape, and disinclination to make other connections. The blame for this collapse cannot be laid entirely on the schools, but the moral problems of this dangerous period will not be solved until the individual can drift easily out of the school into organizations whose influence is in the direction of clean activity.

There are signs of great promise. A profound change of mood is coming over the churches; the drift is setting strongly toward the Messianic notion of a redeemed earth. It finds expression in Chautauqua circles, institutional churches, and all the activities that seek to bring to the surface what is good in human nature. If this process works itself out on a large scale, and social organizations provide for the care of the younger people, the moral gap will surely close. The capacity for coöperation increases very rapidly in adolescence, and the moral possibilities in this direction have been hardly tested. By fostering this capacity the public schools can, through the organization of their musical, artistic, scientific, agricultural, and other interests,

build a bridge of desire over which a large number of boys and girls can pass into the more juvenile forms of the world's organized religious and social activity. All this will help to avoid corruption. Moral teaching cannot save a people once corrupted. While Rome was enjoying the benefit of the purest moral teaching the pagan world had been able to devise, she was going swiftly to her moral ruin. Good doctrine by itself is not so good a defense against moral degeneration as is innocent activity, and the schools can contribute largely to the moral soundness of the future by directing the surging activity of later childhood into channels that will open into the general stream of adult life. If the grown-up child can be kept under conditions that work automatically in favor of virtue, we shall no longer need to worry about his moral doom.

The men of Finland once obeyed the law from reverence for it. Then came the few recent desperate years of Russian autocracy, and where confidence and love once sat, the moral vultures of suspicion and hatred perched. Their liberties have been restored, but they have probably paid the terrible moral price. Their old respect for the majesty of the law is only limping back, and may always be a cripple. And as the moral revulsion came to the men of Finland, so has it come to many a boy and girl. It is a terrible thing to have the moral faith once shocked, but until the schools help fill the gap between childhood and manhood with clean activity, their work will be largely lost upon the children and the shock is sure to come. Only by this filling of the gap can the moral results produced in the schools be preserved, and worthy aspiration be added to knowledge.

IV

Hitherto the discussion has dealt with the general conditions that will strengthen the moral power of the school over the child at present, and with the bearings of its work on the period of adolescence. The appeal has nowhere been made to the purely theoretical; the effort has been to point out the vast moral significance of forms of school activity which have been amply tested, and which, chiefly for that reason, should be made universal elements of our education instead of being confined to a few favored places. We have now to deal more directly with the business of moral instruction.

The conditions for moral instruction are even more favorable in the public schools than in the churches, because the schools reach all the children; and one of our greatest present moral needs is a general dissemination of sound moral thought. Moreover, the child is better equipped to receive moral instruction than the average adult. Children recognize themselves as responsible beings and do not charge necessity with their misdemeanors. In them villainy has not been perfected as in Iago and Richard III, and none but the few pitiful moral imbeciles will say of conscience, with Antonio, "I feel not this deity in my bosom." The dicta of conscience are still authoritative; its method harmonizes with the fact that authority still stands in the foreground of their experience. They have not yet begun definitely to measure vice and crime by a scale of penalties and a system of casuistry. Feeling still predominates over judgment and so the time is favorable for the training of both.

By the time the children leave the common schools the whole question of duty and its authority lies open before them. One of our chief concerns is to know what view of morals will create the greatest stability and give moral principles validity under all circumstances. If the general welfare is accepted as the only sanction of duty, its power breaks down at the very place where it is needed most in modern society. The spirit of tribal morality is inadequate, because the modern community is so large, and its interests are so complex and diverse, that there is almost nothing that the citizens have in common. The tendency grows stronger to restrict moral obligation to the affairs of those with whom we come in direct contact.

Without either insisting or desiring that the religious sanctions of morality be directly taught in the schools, we may here admit the secret of the perennial power of the religious sanction of morality as it is generally understood in our country. It is based not on the power to command and the duty to obey, but on a personal, spiritual relation between the individual and his God, — a relation that is immediate, constant, and worthy, and that no changes in life or environment can modify. History has proved this Hebrew-Christian view to be the only one that can hold common men intellectually and spiritually true to the best ideals of the race. The imperative character of duty is based on mutual interests that are permanent and vital; any other view tends to let morals drop to the level of calculation, where, as in the opinion of Epicurus, stealing is bad only through the fear of being caught. No sound moral condition can be established on transitory personal interests, and I am not convinced that we can get along

without spiritual leading. We have profited so largely by it that we naïvely assume that its results are native to us; but even the agnostic Huxley feared lest a generation that had cut loose from Christian moral sanctions might lose its grip on the things that are worth while in life. The man who feels that "limping death, lashed on by fate," cuts off his interests in moral as well as physical things, has no good reason to curb his impulse. The doctrines of God and immortality cannot be taught in the schools, but those of freedom and responsibility can be, and the others are bound to lie as moral assumptions beneath the actual work of the schools. Let us see what history says.

The growth of this spiritual relation of the Hebrew to his God urged him constantly into higher moral conceptions and transformed his intense tribal feeling into the notion of human brotherhood. His piety and reverence for law were no greater than those of the ancient Roman; but the Roman's piety and reverence collapsed because no spiritual relation grew up between the Roman and his gods, while those of the Hebrew became universal.

We are now face to face with tribal morality. Primitive nations know little about virtues that include the happiness of all men. The Greek restricted his goodness mostly to his free fellow-citizens; the mediæval knight cared chiefly for those of his class; the Crow Indian was, on his own plane, a moral model toward his tribesmen, and a rascal and thief to all outsiders; and there is some honor among gamblers and thieves. Clifford frankly held that conscience is a tribal matter, and that, when the individual loses his special moral interest in the tribe, he loses his identity

with it. But when the community and its interests become too large for a man's personal loyalty and too complex for his mental grasp, when its safety is almost beyond his help and he is only a minute item in its general life, the tribal conscience loses its grip; duty drops to second place, and a man's rights forge to the foreground of his thought; he becomes an outsider to every one that he does business with. Nemesis sits in the shadow of the tribesman, and the consequences of his misdeeds are simple, grave, and direct. In a large, complex society, politicians can betray their trusts, and business men can make our clothing, food, and medicine the vehicles of fraud, because they are beyond easy reach of the victims. Complexity is the friend of impunity. And when the moral restraint is only external corporation morals become a stench and business drops to the level of the methods of the lonely, rapacious feline.

But tribal morality, even with its limitations, is hard to kill. It develops itself in a thousand ways within the great group. One of its most interesting forms is that represented by the labor union. Workingmen, believing with Goldsmith and the most of us that "laws grind the poor, and rich men rule the law,"— that the economic and social forces are against them, — set up the sharp and simple motto, "Take care of your own interests and stand by your own class," and maintain tribal standards of loyalty among themselves and of conduct toward outsiders. I do not believe that the tyrannical elements of the labor union are either necessary or valuable, but even if they are not, and though the popular conscience does not approve of it, its morality is better than feline corporation morals.

If we have not already reached the apex of our moral progress; the work of the schools is clearly cut out for them by existing conditions and tendencies. Their task is to make forcible moral principles of universal validity. It is true that Christianity has not yet made good its promise. The typical Christian traits have hardly become our national traits. But Christian teaching has turned into moral axioms things that the ancients hardly understood, and has laid the emphasis on those things for which all men have capacities and which they approve in their best moods. It has inculcated the virtues that make for strength and purity, and condemned not only the deadly sins that make life so vile but the little ones that make it so mean; it has put the moral problem in the heart, and made the cardinal virtues buoyant by linking them with the Christian graces; it has taught not only how to shun sin, but how to shake it off by repentance. And history bears witness that all the finest human characters have exemplified the beautiful moral traits on which Christianity has laid stress, and that therein lay their greatness.

By laying primary stress on the infinite value of the human soul, Christian teaching builds a new foundation for self-respect. It exercises its greatest influence not by upbraiding vice, but by setting up a model; not by trampling evil, but by changing desire. It makes, not the state or the general welfare, but a personal spiritual relation, the starting point of duty. It teaches us that "self-love is not so vile a sin as self-neglecting," and that love for others is the test of brotherhood. By its old instruction, "Do unto others as ye would that they should do unto you," it tries to teach us fair play, and makes the sanest

moral plea the world has ever heard. It deals with life as a struggle; and history bears it out. Virtue runs high only while the people are conquering difficulties.

While Christianity cannot and need not be taught in the public schools, it will be a great gain if the fact is recognized that its tendency is to strengthen the ideals on which alone republics can rest. Liberty rests on a foundation of self-control and moral responsibility. When it is recognized that the teachings of Christianity are great because of their validity, she can be left to take care of herself, and the principles of life that she lays down will be seen to be what all the people need and what most of them desire. The hopeful phase of the situation is due to the fact that opinion favors it. Educators could not renovate morals if the people approved of folly. Faust's redemption, it has been said, rested on the fact that the devil could not make him admit that evil is good. Dentatus, — thrice consul, — when he refused the gold of Pyrrhus while he sat by the hearth and boiled the turnips for his own meal, could be a hero only while the people approved his act. In later time nearly all of Rome would have called him a fool.

V

In order to give such moral training as will afterwards be effective under all circumstances, it is necessary that general moral principles be dealt with in the later grades. Instruction cannot be confined to studies of specific virtues merely. It is far from being true that the older children in the grades cannot grasp general moral principles. Nothing is more impressive to the growing mind than general

principles abundantly reënforced with illustrations. The best proof of this is that in other school subjects general principles are easily dealt with. The methods now used in the schools are largely new. New methods, better-trained teachers, and revised estimates of values have within two decades transformed our education, and the methods required for moral training are the same as those that have been so vigorously discussed and so brilliantly applied in the general work of the schools.

A special difficulty is the fact that the question of morals is an intensely personal one. Every wise teacher knows that personal applications are always dangerous, and in class work usually not useful; but beyond this the whole field of public and private conduct will contribute materials. The other limitation placed upon us by the law is no greater than one that teachers frequently impose upon themselves in other matters. A thoroughly good foundation of biological knowledge can be laid down without a formal consideration of the principle of evolution. Indeed, it is better to have a good substratum of fact, and an understanding of the laws of structure and function, before the unifying, explanatory principle is formally taken up. Likewise in moral instruction, moral truths can be quite well organized and moral principles studied, without entering seriously into the questions of the natural history of morals at all. Let us look seriously at the possibilities of moral instruction.

The belief that retribution for wrong is a part of the world's constitution is the most primitive contribution to the world's moral thought. The Greek dramatists taught that it was a divine principle that the sinner should suffer.

The friends of Job went so far as to impute sin to him because evil had befallen him. All the historical lines through which we inherit our moral thought have sent this doctrine down to us.

Job could not account for his suffering, and proposed to do right regardless of current philosophy. Despair of moral justice has been the minor strain of grief that runs through the music of human life. We still struggle with Job's problem, and ask Heine's question,

> Warum schleppt sich blutend, elend,
> Unter Kreuzlast der Gerechte,
> Während glücklich als ein Sieger
> Trabt auf hohem Ross der Schlechte?

We know that the profit-and-loss doctrine of morality is not strictly true; the righteous have been too often subjected to physical or social torture; but whatever we may think of the suffering of the innocent, we not only cannot shake off the belief that wrongdoing will be punished sooner or later, but there is a general human desire that such punishment shall be inflicted. Children can understand requital better than why the raindrops fall.

Without a measurable relation between wrongdoing and punishment there could be no society. We constantly seek to establish such a relation in our laws and our beliefs. Both older and current history are crowded with materials for the study of every phase of the subject; and nothing can affect the imagination of older children more powerfully than moral studies that show to what lengths consequences run through the long, dim vistas of time. Such studies make it clear that our "one inalienable right is the right to behave."

Such training can furnish a permanent antidote for despair by a study of resourcefulness; by teaching men not to chide fate but to defeat its apparent purposes; by showing them how a resourceful spirit can transform the hard, flinty nodules of necessity into opportunities with which to conquer fate. And for such a purposeful study the records of artists, teachers, soldiers, statesmen, and business men furnish abundant materials. The desultory reference to such things merely spoils the material.

As a supplementary study, attention can be given to the way in which time, the great independent variable, brings about the solution of our difficulties in its own uncontrollable way; and for a text might be taken the stinging words of Epictetus, "Art thou not ashamed to be more cowardly than fugitive slaves?" If the schools fail to help us toward spiritual calmness they will fail to make a possible contribution to our happiness. As one of a thousand examples might be cited the foolish action of the Iowa harvestmen who smashed the new reapers from fear of losing work. Their fear was the foreshadowing of something which never came to pass. There was soon more work than ever. Their fear was not only selfish but groundless.

VI

If public morality is to have a corrective quality, the moral judgment must equip itself with facts and understand their bearings; the common people need both facts and penetrating power. What does it avail the children if they pass in arithmetic, and then go out into the world to become half-willing victims of fraud, and invest their earnings

in the golden projects of promoters, to prefer patent medicine to scientific treatment, to run with faith to fortune tellers? Nearly all the organs of opinion accessible to the people are averse to giving them true information. As long as hope runs after false lights there will be moral wrong. If there were provision for moral training the schools could give sorely needed information along the lines of actual social need.

And out of such a study would grow another, — the responsibility of ignorance. As a text could be taken the legal principle that ignorance of the law is no defense; and out of it could be brought the fact that when knowledge is possible, ignorance is somebody's sin. Here is the kernel of the moral function of the public schools. Right knowledge would make imposition difficult; and I cling to the notion that a good way to make the world better is to make life hard for the willful impostor by correlating the people's knowledge with their needs.

The ethics of public law as a study in negative morality is within the easy reach of children. Out of it could be worked the facts that public law as a rule prescribes punishments but not rewards, and that the great body of the law under which we live is unwritten; and these facts would open up another large field of study, which could be rounded off with proof that the good man is a law unto himself.

Then self-sacrifice, the moral puzzle of the selfish man, can be made the basis of a study in both moral beauty and reason. When its beauty is pointed out to the children, and they are made to see how the world appreciates it and glorifies the actor, and are urged to set a right value on

it, they need to be shown how deep into life self-sacrifice sends its roots. Neither human nor animal life is possible without it. Self-preservation is the first law of nature only when the future interests of the race are not involved. When the mother hen watches and fights to keep her little brood safe from the pirates of the sky, it is not nature's purpose to make a fool of her, but to have her protect those now helpless for future usefulness. The winning types are those whose gaze is fixed on the horizon. Personal human heroism is only one of the admirable forms of self-sacrifice, the test of which is that its benefits shall accrue to those who might suffer or perish without it.

Its beauty and importance can be immeasurably heightened by rearing up alongside of it a careful study of its slimy opposite, — avarice,

> whose gorge ingluts more prey
> Than every beast beside, yet is not filled.

There are perhaps as many now as ever whose creed is, "Rich preys make true men thieves," and whose principle of action is that of the Bastard in King John, —

> Bell, book, and candle shall not drive me back,
> When gold and silver becks me to come on.

And the historical materials for a study of this vice are only too abundant. For biographies, there are Alcibiades and Demosthenes, — chronic bribe takers, — and Lysander, who spoiled his people's character with gold; Claudius, who bribed his soldiers to spare his life; and farsighted Eumenes who, instead of giving, borrowed money from the grandees who would have killed him and walked thenceforth in safety. From modern history, Turkey, the vilest

government in Europe, could be shown to owe its safety to its debts. If in an evil moment it should pay its European bondholders, the great Christian nations would crush it for its crimes. For its effect on patriotism, attention might be directed to the gun makers of Birmingham, who sell weapons secretly to the barbarians that are fighting Britain openly; and to the South African mine owners for whom their mother country waged unrighteous war and destroyed two brave nations, and who in return import Chinese coolies and establish semi-slavery and help bring on the political overthrow of the party that did their bidding. From such as these it can be proved that a moral fortune is better in old age than a financial one. It is not enough to preach the wrong of avarice to an avaricious people. We cure malaria now by draining mosquito ponds and not by gathering more Peruvian bark for quinine. So the power of contentment can be taught from the life of Dentatus and a thousand others.

Promise breaking, too, could be made a wonderful study if the social necessity of fidelity to pledges were taken as the starting point. From this point of view it could be shown why the words "I do hate thee worse than a promise breaker" express the bitter limit of contempt, and why men so utterly despise those who "break their oath and resolution like a thread of rotten silk." A good way to strengthen a moral feeling is to give a reason for it.

One of the profoundest bits of philosophy ever uttered is the saying, "Whosoever hath, to him shall be given; and whosoever hath not, from him shall be taken away even that which he thinketh he hath." It is the doctrine of cumulative effects, the moral form of the law of gravitation.

Herbert Spencer wrote a group of chapters to give it adequate treatment; Jesus embalmed it in a sentence. Illustrations for it can be picked up in the street and in the schoolroom, seen in the running water and in the progress of disease. A few weeks' attention to it will make it hiss among the facts of life like the whiplash of fate. The heavy pressure of such a principle will after a while compress facts and thoughts into solid convictions. In its prudential form every child can see that any kind of surplus is both a club and a shield. Mitchell's first instruction to the miners was that they should lay their money by as a weapon in the prospective strike of 1906. If properly presented it is all within the reach of children's minds.

One of the noblest moral tasks that lie before the public schools is that of showing the fundamental reasonableness of the Golden Rule and of making the children see that in most matters decent men and women habitually practice the noble doctrine; that it is the basis of self-respect and the security of social life; that it is only another form of the advice to "put yourself in his place." And an important special application of it can be made to the unworthy judgments that we all pass on others, by showing that it would eliminate nearly all the personal prejudices, gossip, slander, heartburnings, by removing the basis of misinterpretation. It would lead the way to spiritual penetration of the moral attitude of others.

A whole series of moral studies could be clustered round Cain's old question, "Am I my brother's keeper?" The studies can be started on the commercial side. No end of interest can be created in the principle of mutual dependence by showing that practically the whole world

coöperates to furnish us the materials of an ordinary breakfast. And when once a pupil is convinced that no man can live unto himself, he will be ready to follow the effects of evil conduct where they spread themselves "like circles in the water" until they are lost from sight in the distant sufferings of unknown human beings; and then he would be ready to consider seriously the question, "Who is my brother?"

The ideals and principles that underlie a noble life are old and simple, and as easily within the reach of children between twelve and fifteen years of age as any of the other subjects of study. The moral weakness of the work of our schools is not due to the incapacity of the children but to the fact that moral knowledge is not carefully enough grouped around the general principles to which the moral facts belong. The doctrine of evolution has become the foundation of scientific thinking because the facts were marshaled masterfully in its behalf.

VII

If the work is constantly planned and given with reference to the results that are desired, the details of method will take care of themselves. "Thou shalt not" is made so familiar to the pupil while in school that he almost comes to think his name is "Johnny Don't." Rules of conduct have little effect in giving an endowment of moral desire. Just because the wicked life is easier than the virtuous one the right training of capacity has more to do with sound morals than moral sermonettes. Love of truth does not grow out of desultory conversation but out of

hard and patient work. The old bark is most surely broken by the growth of the new. One of our best educators has shown how the methods of our schools repress capacity for social service by compelling forty pupils to study and recite the same lessons. Emulation and rivalry among the brighter ones, and a sense of hopelessness among the duller ones, are the moral influences that are set going. If each could have a separate task, he would be making an individual contribution. This thought involves a fundamental principle. Uniform lessons have the same effect as military drill; both the verve and the results of a romp are missing. I have repeatedly emphasized the fact that the chief moral work of the schools is to direct the powers, tastes, and desires. The tough boy cannot be taught to pity birds, but he can be turned into a bird lover by being led to take a bird census of his neighborhood and determine their numbers, order of appearance in spring, nesting and feeding habits. The little school gardens, with each child responsible for a plot, will cure malicious mischief faster than sermons. It is the difference between telling them and showing them. A boy will not step on an angleworm while he watches the rhythmic pulsing of the blood along its back. The sure way to good feeling is to widen the horizon of the imagination and deepen the interest. Membership in a little brass band puts the individual where his regularity, obedience to instruction, and coöperation are largely voluntary in their origin, and the moral results are even greater than the musical.

The recent high-school tendency to form secret fraternities, — one of the results of college influence, — which so many thoughtful educators hardly know how to handle,

might, at least to some extent, be made a power for good by turning it toward the formation of civic clubs and voluntary groups for the study of problems that the pupils will face in earnest later on. It would create links with practical life and partly obviate the doubtful expedient of repression. We do our best to make the children patriotic by means of flag and drum. Much more could be done if, as has been suggested, the organized celebrations of Fourth of July and Washington's Birthday were placed in the hands of the schools and their children. So much for setting the natural powers at work.

The best friend of conscience is the habit of keeping alternative courses of action in mind while decisions are being made. This does not come from reciting lessons, but from putting facts face to face. It involves not merely accepting facts but setting a value on them. But neither the power nor the habit to do this is likely to come to any one who does not while in school learn to refer moral facts habitually to the great principles that govern life. Nothing but this reflection based on training can help the native human goodness to work itself out into a sound personal life. It is only by making our children moral thinkers that we can provide the basis of virtue on which alone republics stand; that we can correlate responsibility with our freedom.

Much that has been suggested may be classed as training in common sense. As I have said, we change our views less often by direct argument than because we grow tired or ashamed of them. What to-day looks like a justification for suicide may to-morrow look ridiculous, simply because time has shifted the pieces in the kaleidoscope of life and

made the pattern of life look different. The individual is like the race. The safest decision is often reached by dropping a subject. If given time, the facts group themselves, the warm light of the feelings plays upon all the considerations, and all the elements react on each other till the problem no longer looks like its former self. Such training is given not by making children debaters, but by making them little judges, so that wisdom shall become a real thing to them.

All this the training of the schools can do. But the sheer goodness which is heedless of reward, before which the world bares its head, — like the love of Kent for his old King Lear, — outlasts and overtowers defeat, pain, weakness, temptation, time, and death. The moral romance of life is not born of any kind of learning, but of love. It does not seek a comfortable adjustment to circumstances, but treats environment and fate as incidents. But the training of the schools can help to make this kind of goodness lovable by showing that the best pleasure does not come by seeking it; it can through history glorify the virility and goodness that do not calculate benefits; it can make pupils feel truth hunger and plant in them the spirit of pursuit, give them the power to unravel facts and weave them together, and so prepare a favorable soil for the growth of greater things. The rest must be left to pure religion.

There are those who think that such a method is incompatible with reverence, but it is not; the average child will never become so dry an analyst that sentiment will evaporate, as it sometimes does in chronic scholars. Ax and blasting powder are not good instruments with which to study the beauty of a landscape; the eyes are best for

that. But the method can provide for contemplation as well as analysis, for the heart as well as the head.

One thing is certain: the moral fate of a highly intelligent community hangs on the answer that the people give to the question, "What think ye of life, — is it a gamble, or a moral school?" Is the spiritual result of life a feature of immortality, or more evanescent than property that is accumulated? Among an ignorant people the answer to this question might have no serious moral effect; but if a cultured people look on life as the sport of fate, moral growth may defeat itself. Our laws have made it possible for a ten-year-old child to prevent the singing of Christmas carols in the schools. Our school children are made more familiar with the literature and myths of Greece and Rome than with the figures and literature of the Bible. But that cannot change the fact that in the last analysis moral safety and the permanent worth of moral training lean on a general faith in a permanent personal relation.

VIII

The teacher in his work as moral trainer has to deal with every kind of moral nature. Some children are too sensitive and need buffeting to toughen their moral fiber; others are pathetic moral imbeciles. It needs a confirmed and resourceful idealist (who at the same time would get pleasure from moderate results) to make the opening through which the schools can enter upon the work of moral training.

On the practical side there has to be faced not only the immense variety of moral nature to be trained and the question of what lines of effort will produce the best future

moral results, but a somewhat general attitude of moral resistance in the schools. I refer to what in one of its phases shows itself as schoolboy honor.

It will be a great gain in dealing with this business when it is clearly recognized that schoolboy honor is only a miniature of what is found in the outside world. The feeling that underlies this attitude is the same as the one that Lamb expressed in his remark about the smuggler. The pupils recognize school authority as something imposed upon them, in which they have none of the sympathy of ownership. In all history men have clung to each other against such authority. The sympathy invariably goes to the man. Defiance is no crime, but tattling is. It is coöperative resistance.

I do not believe the sentiment can be uprooted, and it should never be put to the test when it can be avoided. The surest antidote for it is a spirit of close coöperation, the growth of a sense of ownership on the part of the pupil and of the sense of self-respect that will make the individual more willing to shoulder his own deeds. If an unavoidable contest comes, a better plan than to extort evidence in a general way is to adopt the government's treatment of a mob that is not amenable to law, — to deal summarily with all who are likely to be guilty and let them take the burden of collective responsibility. In most cases, — as in one of college discipline with which I was familiar, — those unfairly dealt with will promptly bring proof of innocence, and the experience, instead of doing moral damage, will be a benefit because it gives them the chance to remove suspicion. A wiser plan may sometimes be to get the information directly from the culprit by agreeing not to use

it, and so establish a relation of mutual confidence, as the famous Judge Lindsey has so often done in his Juvenile Court at Denver. A frank discussion of the causes of misconduct may make its future occurrence impossible. In any case, the effect of the direct moral instruction given will depend largely on the moral atmosphere created by the practical working of the school machinery.

IX

Three points remain to be briefly dealt with: the available materials, the method of using them, and the bearing of the quality of the teacher on moral instruction.

History is recognized, by all who are interested in the matter, as the mother lode of ethical materials. The study of war may nurse the heroic virtues, but the chief value of history as a source lies in the study of causes and consequences and of biography. A wide basis for the study of moral antecedents and consequences could be laid by studies of such materials as the explorations of the fifteenth century, which show so clearly how each act becomes the basis for a later one. What would furnish a finer moral study for older pupils than the fact, emphasized by Lecky, that during the period of their combined influence on Roman life, Stoicism furnished nearly every effort on behalf of liberty, while Epicureanism was constantly identified with tyranny and corruption? A whole set of interesting historico-ethical studies could be made out of apparently dry materials. If our children do not receive the moral inheritance which the ages have left for them, the responsibility for their loss rests upon us.

It is true that little children lack the perspective power necessary for landscape studies in history. The consequences are too long and badly tangled. But even a child can grasp some of the moral effects of the invention of the cotton gin. They can understand the units of history, and so biography is naturally the best material for early use. The judgment of the American people on Benedict Arnold has been for generations fixed by the children's early knowledge of him. The triumphs of sacrifice and the shame of selfishness are written in easy words in the lives of Washington, Burr, Webster, Lincoln, Morse. Current history alone would furnish material enough for studies in motives and consequences, but as Adler has so well shown, the earlier literature of the race is better for the young, because it presents primary human motives in large outlines.

There is no lack of material, but it is largely unselected and unorganized. A vast amount of it is available in fiction, drama, art, poetry, history, economics, and science, but no widely systematic use of it can be made until more work is done along the line of Adler's *Moral Instruction of Children.* If we should ever seriously want materials to teach the doctrine of consequences and point the lessons of ingratitude, an unbroken graded series for all the children could be arranged, from the simple story of Cain to the work of Nemesis in Shakespeare's *Lear.*

Adler's arrangement of materials for early moral instruction has permanent merit because it follows the well-tested method of ordinary school work. Fairy tales with the moral in solution, fables with single moral questions crystallized, and Homeric and Biblical characters involving interrelated

moral traits and the interweaving of moral causes and effects, lie ready in abundance. Its availability for school use is no proof that it will be used. The sciences have only now come into their rights as subjects of study.

I think the future of moral training and the use of available material hinges on the settlement of a preliminary question. There has been a good deal written about the relative value of the formal and the incidental methods of giving moral instruction. If my contention is sound, that moral instruction to be effective must group its materials around general principles, the incidental method is ruled out of court; because general principles can never be adequately treated by occasional references to them in the course of other work. The general criticism to be made against most of the efforts at moral instruction hitherto put forth in the public schools is that they have been ineffective just because they have been desultory. When they have been extensive they have produced monotony, as constant harping on one string will always do. The incidental method cannot provide definite progression. Instead of giving the pupil a sound grasp on moral principles, it merely leads him to apply such views as he already holds to whatever case happens to come up.

If formal instruction is necessary in order to make the moral work effective, we do not have to invent new plans. In graded schools the supervisors of art and music have become almost necessities; and their coming is nearly always like a morning breeze. When moral instruction begins in earnest it can at first be handled best by some one teacher, say the principal, for a building. The children will thus get what they need, and the teachers by

degrees will learn to coöperate and grow familiar with the material and methods. The individual teacher's active part in the work will alone save it from developing, in the pupil's eyes, into professionalism.

I do not think it would be advisable to have the children use graded text-books in morals, but the teacher needs to be equipped with a systematic method, and materials adjusted to the grades. The studies can be varied in form by means of formal talks, conference, reading, a study of principles and cases, without much casuistry, and with no hairsplitting at all. When such instruction is given by the living voice once or twice a week it will come like music, — as a relief, — and will meet with coöperation on the part of the pupils, if the amount of analysis is carefully graded to their capacity. That, at least, has been the result in the comparatively few known experiments that have been made with a clear grasp of means and ends. There is really nothing in our experience to cause discouragement. Even the Sunday schools themselves have failed chiefly through their addiction to desultory methods. Instruction founded carefully on general principles, given by the living voice, in an atmosphere free from the spirit of recitation and examination, in a period consecrated to the contemplation of life and its meaning, could not fail to affect personal life to some extent; and even if it did not, it would give a form of intellectual stimulus that it alone can provide.

The most serious handicap to sound moral training in the schools has been and is our point of view. The ideals of the profession find formal expression in the examination system, and the pressure is so great that way that it leaves neither time nor desire to devote to a kind of work whose

results cannot be easily measured. There is a latent moral power in our half million common-school teachers that we have hardly tested yet. When they become fully conscious of it themselves they will be the American prophets of morality.

Even when we are fully agreed on what moral training shall be given, we have only stated the problem. The solution depends on the moral quality of the teacher. Earth's greatest religion was made so by the example of its founder. At the end of its long historical vista stands his great personality and dissolves all moral questions into a personal relation. And children are like men, — their working ideals are personal derivatives. We Americans like to repeat the names of our famous teachers, but we cannot forget that their power was a moral one. The first step toward cleanliness is to make the victim feel dirty. "Thou wouldst do them good, — then do not chatter to them, but show them in thyself what manner of men philosophy can make." Moral enthusiasm is the leaven of the school as well as of society. Children are the first to recognize both disinterested service and its opposite. A teacher who has her hat and gloves on when the dismissal bell rings cannot give moral training.

We reject moral looseness but do not yet definitely require moral power in our teachers. We have made great strides. Ascham says what applies as well to later times, that eminent Englishmen chose carefully the trainers for their horses, but were indifferent to the moral quality of those who trained their boys. We do better now. The teacher's profession is no longer a last resort. We have traveled a long way since Epictetus naïvely asked whether,

if the worst should come, a man could not transcribe writings, teach children, or be a doorkeeper. We now insist upon sound and abundant knowledge, clear thinking, and power of exposition in a teacher of intellectual things. The time has come when we need to add to these requirements familiarity with the moral history of our civilization, with ethical principles and sanctions, and with the bearings of art, science, literature, economics, and history on practical morality.

And there are signs of great promise. The teachers of the country are becoming more highly organized, and there is coming to the surface and spreading itself over every phase of the teacher's work and relations to the public an ethics of the profession. The National Education Association has developed great moral influence, and is concerning itself earnestly with moral problems. Through these organizations there is coming a conscious recognition, by the educational forces, of the nation's moral drift, and a conviction that the trend of school work should be in a direction to meet and mold the social conditions out of which a people's morals grow. Just now, in this time of promise, we need greatly a few inspiring books that deal with moral history, means and ends and methods for the schoolroom, — books not for the pupils but for the teachers. When some master comes, as Andrew D. White came into the field of historical teaching at Ann Arbor, he, too, will make great things easy in the field of moral training in the public schools.

FRANK CRAMER

PALO ALTO, CALIFORNIA

V

HOW can more efficient moral training be given in the public school?

A manufacturer seeking to increase the efficiency of his plant may well, first of all, take an inventory of the work actually done; second, study what is being done in other factories making the same or a similar product; third, consider what contribution to efficiency may be made by scientific principles not yet applied or only imperfectly applied; and finally formulate a plan of procedure on the basis of this comparative and scientific study.

While moral training is not a mechanical process comparable to that of the factory, but is rather a process of growth and development, the application of sound business common sense is equally necessary. It is proposed in this study to consider briefly the ways in which American public schools to-day contribute to moral training; to examine the provisions for moral training made by the German, French, and English public schools; to bring together from these sources the significant facts and principles which, in the light of genetic psychology, are most fundamental in moral training, and on this basis to propose a plan for making such training more effective in the public school.

IN AMERICAN SCHOOLS

Lack of uniformity is the first thing which impresses one who attempts to consider the contribution of American schools to moral training. American public education is fundamentally a local matter.

Several states, however, have attempted to provide for moral training in their schools. The laws passed for this purpose vary, from that of North Carolina, which merely requires that teachers shall "encourage morality," to that of West Virginia, which charges "all teachers, boards of education, and other school officers with the duty of providing that moral training for the youth of this state which will contribute to securing good behavior and manners, and furnish the state with exemplary citizens." It is obvious that these laws are commentaries on the art of lawmaking, rather than actual forces for moral training in the schools.

Some states have made Bible reading in the school a subject of legal enactment or judicial decision, nine prescribing it, twelve giving it a legal status, and five forbidding it. These regulations, particularly those forbidding Bible reading, are more generally enforced than those concerning moral training.

All of the states affect, in a slight degree, the efficiency of their schools for moral training (except the schools of those cities which examine their own teachers), through the standard of attainment required of teachers in order to secure the teaching certificate. The state provisions for the removal of immoral teachers by local authority, and for the prevention of saloons and immoral houses locating near

school buildings, also have some bearing on the moral efficiency of the school.

Aside from these limitations, each city, town, or rural school district is a law unto itself as far as the moral influences of its schools are concerned.

In a few cities the school board and superintendent provide, as at Anderson, Indiana, for an extended systematic course in moral instruction. In other cities the board, in its printed regulations, calls the attention of the teacher to the importance of making each part of school life count for moral training, and provides him with a syllabus on ethics suggesting how this may be done. New York City is an illustration. Other city boards leave their teachers without printed regulations or suggestions of any kind, the superintendent bringing the question before them from time to time in teachers' meetings or by circular letter. In still other city schools, and in nearly all village and rural schools, the matter is entirely in the hands of the individual teacher, and whatever is done for moral training must be done on his initiative.

Consequently the direct moral instruction actually given in the schools varies greatly. Nearly all teachers devote the first few minutes of the day to "opening exercises." Most of them — about seventy-five per cent — use Bible readings, or the Lord's Prayer, or both, along with religious or patriotic songs, for these exercises. Some give short ethical talks, or read stories containing moral lessons. Many have their pupils learn proverbs, mottoes, precepts, or short selections from literature which have a moral import. Some take advantage of every opportunity which the regular lessons afford to point a moral. Others

give a few earnest words of moral instruction whenever an incident of school life offers a favorable opportunity. Most teachers use several of these means for giving direct instruction in morals. Few, if any, schools are entirely without such instruction, although a formal course of study is rarely followed. In a word, direct moral instruction is nearly always incidental and unsystematic.

But American educators rely chiefly on *indirect* means for moral training. Let us examine some features of the public school which are indirectly significant as regards moral training.

Prominent among these is the lack of professionally trained teachers. Hughes calls this the weakest point in the American school system. Even in Massachusetts, which heads the list, less than half the public-school teachers have had a normal-school course. Taking the United States as a whole, not one city teacher in four has received such training, while in many states where the population is chiefly rural less than half have received any education whatever beyond the grammar grades. Very few high-school teachers, even in the larger cities, have had any professional training. Besides this, many teachers who graduated from so-called normal-school courses attended institutions whose chief aim was to prepare for teachers' examinations rather than for teaching. Teachers' associations and institutes, summer schools, reading circles, etc., have done much to supplement the work of normal schools, but are by no means a substitute for it. Moreover, the brief professional life of the American teacher, said to be five years, — indeed, for the rural teacher, only two years, — shows that schools are largely

in the hands of those who lack the training of experience as well as that of the normal school. The significance of this situation for moral training in the school is perhaps sufficiently obvious without comment, but it will appear more clearly later.

A second feature of the American school having an important bearing on moral training is the predominance of female teachers. Statistics of the Bureau of Education show that nearly three fourths of public-school teachers are women. In many states the percentage is much larger, — Massachusetts having ten female teachers to one male. The Moseley Educational Commission expressed alarm at "the growing preponderance of women teachers," one member lamenting that "the boy in America is not being brought up to punch another boy's head, or to stand having his own punched in a healthy and proper manner." German critics maintain that our schools are training a race of effeminate men, lacking in virile, aggressive qualities. Prominent American educators take the same view and plead for more male principals and teachers in the higher grades, especially in the high school.

The organization and management of the American school, moreover, have an important bearing on moral education. In the main, the organization is such as to give the teacher a great deal of independence and to encourage initiative and a feeling of responsibility, though in some city systems nearly everything is prescribed and outlined by central authority. Where the teacher has a fair degree of freedom his management generally provides an atmosphere favorable to free and natural development of the moral nature. The relations between teacher and

pupil are more intimate and friendly than in the schools of any other great nation. Discipline is more incidental and based on interest in the work of the hour. Practically all members of the Moseley Commission report that they were greatly impressed by these two things, — the relations between teachers and pupils and the dependence of discipline on interest. Both of these give free play to the personality of the teacher, on which H. Thistleton Mark, the eminent English educator, after extensive study, concluded was placed the chief reliance for moral training in American schools. It must be confessed that both Mr. Mark and the Moseley Commission visited only our better schools, but they unquestionably hit upon characteristic features.

American methods of teaching place much responsibility on the pupil, leave a great deal for him to work out for himself, and thus serve better than European methods to develop self-reliance and initiative.

The regular studies of the curriculum — especially reading, history, literature, manual training, and nature study — are generally conceded to have an important bearing on moral training. But in the main the subjects taught in the American school are not different from those taught in Germany, France, and England, — though a German writer, Gizicki, has pointed out that American school readers are richer than those of Germany in moral incidents from current life. The hero of the American reader is more apt to belong to the present generation and to have risen from the ranks of the common people, while the hero of the German reader is of royal blood and of a generation or more ago.

The fact that American public schools are not class institutions, as are those of Europe, but institutions in which the children of rich and poor alike mingle, has its significance for the development of social and democratic virtues.

There are also many features of American schools, less common than the above, which have a place in character building. Among these may be mentioned schoolroom decorations, pupil organizations in the higher grades and the high school, physical training, — including games and athletic activities, — efforts to influence the out-of-school reading of pupils, school gardens, the "school city" and other coöperative means of school government. Here again it must be remembered that none of these is exclusively American, though some are more highly developed here than elsewhere. More will be said of these later.

IN GERMAN SCHOOLS

In German schools no provision is made for formal instruction in morals. There is, however, in every grade of schools below the universities, very definite and very direct instruction in religion.

The aim of religious instruction is frankly stated to be, in the higher schools, Christian leadership; in the common schools, Christian citizenship. But, as will be seen later, "Christian" is interpreted very largely in terms of dogma and mysticism.

The instruction is always sectarian in character, — in most schools Lutheran, in many Catholic, in fewer Jewish; seldom anything else than these three. Every pupil is

expected to receive religious instruction; respect must be paid to the religious preferences of the parents; the instruction must be given by a teacher approved by the state. Practically all the teachers have had the advantage of a three-year training course in which religion occupied a prominent place.

In the people's (or common) schools, religious instruction is given four hours per week throughout the course. During the first two years the teacher tells the pupils Old- and New-Testament stories, and teaches them many Bible texts and a few hymns. Then follows a connected and more detailed course in Old- and New-Testament history. Later, much time is devoted to church history, including history of the apostolic church, the church fathers, the development of Christianity during the Middle Ages, the introduction of Christianity into Germany, and the Reformation. The Reformation is studied in great detail in the Lutheran schools. In these schools, too, Luther's catechism is taught from the first, and is used as a basis for doctrinal instruction. The Bible is read in the class. The church sacraments are explained, and the origin and meaning of special church days are pointed out. Throughout the course pupils are required to commit many passages of Scripture and sacred songs. According to Schmidt's Encyclopædia the child leaves the people's school at the age of fourteen with a memory stock of at least three hundred and fifty Bible texts, thirty-five Christian hymns, the five chief articles of the catechism, and the seventy-three responses of his confirmation book.

In the higher schools, which receive boys at nine and offer them either a six- or a nine-year course, religion is

taught three hours per week the first year, and two hours per week each of the succeeding years. In general outline the course of the higher schools does not differ materially from that of the people's schools. It is, however, much more comprehensive in character: it includes far more advanced work in church history and dogma, adds theology and the theory of Christian ethics, is more critical and scientific, and besides is taught by men of university training.

It is hardly necessary to say that this course of study abounds in material that is of little or no value for moral training. Many of the facts of Biblical and church history, much of the catechism, the church calendar, dogmatic theology, and church creeds belong to this list.

On the other hand, the course is enormously rich in ethical content. It brings before the pupil the moral teachings of the entire Bible, — the stern commands of the Decalogue, the fervid exhortations and denunciations of the Prophets, the sublime moral principles of the Christ. It includes also numerous examples of moral heroism and moral cowardice, and frequent illustrations of rewarded virtue and punished wrong. Again, it brings under tribute the ethical content of church history. True, this has its dark moral side, but it presents also many illustrations of forceful moral character, high ideals, self-sacrificing altruism, heroic devotion to the principles of Christian morality.

Moreover, aside from its ethical content, much of the purely religious training which this course affords is tremendously important for the moral life. The beliefs that God knows the thoughts and motives of the human heart; that it is possible to draw upon the infinite resources of Heaven for help in moral crises; that divine forgiveness

of sin may be secured upon repentance, confession, and faith; that a heaven of reward or a hell of punishment awaits the soul at the close of this life, — have been and are powerful factors in determining human character and conduct. In fact, religious instruction in German schools rests on the assumption that these doctrines are the basis of morality.

But the value of a course of study, either for intellectual or moral culture, is not determined wholly by its content. It depends also upon its relation to the life of him who pursues it and upon the manner in which it is presented.

There are many indications that the course of study outlined above is not closely related to the lives of German pupils. A casual reading impresses one that it would give knowledge about the Christian religion rather than implant a vital religious faith or cultivate practical morality. Many of the clergy complain that the religious instruction in the schools lacks vitality. Teachers of the higher schools insist that there is too much pure memory grind, too much catechism and dogma, too much Jewish and church history; that these become a burden to the pupil and defeat the very purpose for which they are given. Professor Kirschner, of Berlin, expresses a feeling quite general among higher-school teachers of Germany when he refers to the religious instruction given in those schools as a "surfeit of religious doctrines, maxims, hymns, forms, ceremonies." A recent writer thinks it would not be far wrong to summarize German opinion thus: "Instruction in religion is absolutely indispensable, but the existing instruction is completely out of harmony with the best thought of the day and stands in need of radical reform."

Nor can it be said that teachers generally present the religious instruction effectively. A large and growing class treat it intellectually, much as arithmetic or history. Another, gradually diminishing, class present it in an extremely devotional manner, — every passage of Scripture studied is inspired, and has some special significance for the pupil. Many combine in varying proportions the intellectual and devotional treatments. A constantly increasing number of the best-trained teachers, especially in the higher schools, are out of sympathy with the rigid orthodoxy of the course of study, and disbelieve much that they are required to teach. Such teaching lacks vitality, to say the least. A German scholar said to me recently: "Religion as taught in the Berlin gymnasium which I attended had nothing to do with life. Its teaching killed the religious spirit, and did not encourage morality." On the other hand, many of the teachers in the people's schools are sufficiently in sympathy with the course of study, and possess the necessary sense of responsibility for the moral and spiritual welfare of their pupils, to make their religious teaching vital. But the vital element is the teacher's personality.

German schools also do much indirectly for moral training. Among the most prominent features contributing to this are (1) the predominance of male teachers, (2) the influence of militarism, (3) thorough professional training of teachers, (4) the German method of instruction, (5) absence of games and play, (6) large classes. Only three of these can be elaborated here, and they very briefly.

Most of the boys and many of the girls never come under the influence of women teachers. In the higher schools for

boys all the teachers are men. In the higher schools for girls the teaching force is nearly equally divided between the two sexes. In the people's schools about eighty-five per cent of the teachers are men. The significance of this situation for moral education must remain to a considerable extent an open question, even when much more shall have been ascertained than is now known concerning the psychology of sex. But, granting only sex differences on which psychologists are most generally agreed, the predominance of male teachers in the German schools stands for the cultivation of egoism rather than altruism, of selfishness rather than self-sacrifice. It lends support to stern and rigorous discipline. It tends to cultivate courage and regard for truth. It emphasizes law, authority, and force, as motives of conduct, rather than love and desire to please the one in authority. It stimulates independence and initiative rather than their opposites.

Militarism, a marked feature of German life, exercises a profound influence on the moral training of the schools. Says Russell:

> Germany is nothing if not military. The school system is pervaded by the military spirit; many of the teachers are reserve officers, most of the pupils hope to be, and all know that army service awaits them at the end of the school days.

Russell is speaking particularly of the higher schools, but the military spirit is equally strong in the people's schools. A precise military air and an exacting military discipline prevail. These require prompt, unquestioning obedience. They emphasize strict attention to the task in hand. They cultivate respect for authority. They magnify the office of the teacher and intensify his official influence.

On the other hand, they are little in sympathy with the trivialities and weaknesses of child life. They emphasize a perfect organization more than individual differences. They repress, rather than cultivate, moral independence and initiative. They tend to prevent amiable relations between teacher and pupil, a fruitful source of moral influence. To quote Russell again, "Good masters have remarked to me — and I am inclined to credit the statement — that the average schoolboy considers an amiable teacher as a prodigy, fit only for a girls' school."

German teachers receive a more thorough professional training than any other teachers in the world. The aspirant to a position in a higher school must first complete a higher-school course. He then spends at least three years in university study. This is followed by the state examination. If successful in this the candidate enters upon a two-year pedagogical course, — one year of it theoretical and one year practice work. He is then ready for appointment, which, however, comes to the average candidate only after nearly six years of waiting, spent usually in assisting or tutoring. Teachers in the people's schools are required to have had six years of training — three years of it distinctly professional — after having completed the course of the people's school. As a result, German teachers give their pupils a more rigorous and exact intellectual training than any other body of teachers in the world. And Harris, De Garmo, Huling, and many others have pointed out that the regular intellectual work of the school exercises great influence in the development of such moral qualities as accuracy, thoroughness, truthfulness, conscientiousness, persistence. Moreover, because of superior professional

training, German teachers make few mistakes, according to German pedagogical ideals and methods, in management, discipline, and teaching, — few of those pedagogical blunders common among untrained teachers, some of which are positively immoral in their influence upon pupils.

IN FRENCH SCHOOLS

France has made a more serious effort than any other great nation to develop character through her public schools. The means chosen is direct moral instruction on a secular basis.

The time devoted to moral instruction in the primary school is, for elementary and intermediate grades (ages seven to eleven), one hour per week, and for the superior grade (ages eleven to thirteen), one and a half hours per week. In general, this time is divided into three equal periods, and apportioned to the first hour of alternate school days. In higher primary schools the time is also one and a half hours per week. The Lycée and communal college, corresponding to the German higher schools, require one hour of ethics per week for two years.

Since less than a hundred and fifty thousand pupils attend the public higher schools of all kinds, and about four million attend the public primary schools, and since conditions in the former are far less favorable to moral training than in the latter, we shall fix our attention chiefly on the primary school.

It has been said that the moral instruction rests on a secular basis. Duty and conscience are the key words. The sanctions of morality are to be found in duty, not in

religion. Duties toward God are included in the official programme, but no church creeds or catechism are taught. As a matter of fact, duties to God are given but little space in the text-books, and appear to be passed over lightly in the teaching, if taught at all.

The great majority of teachers have spent two hours per week, during the two years of their normal-school course, in the study of "psychology, morals, and pedagogy," as special preparation for this work. The teacher at work is provided with elaborate instructions and suggestions concerning the task of moral instruction. He is given a carefully outlined course of study, or "official programme," and his pupils are, in general, provided with text-books prepared according to this official programme. There are in reality three such programmes, — one for each of the divisions of the primary school.

The elementary programme (ages seven to nine) is chiefly suggestive. The teacher is to engage in familiar conversations with the pupils and to read to them moral examples, precepts, parables, and fables; also to direct practical exercises tending to put morality into action in the class itself (1) by individual observation of the pupils' characters, (2) by intelligent application of school discipline, (3) by incessant appeal to the feelings and the moral judgment of the child, (4) by correcting false notions, superstitions, prejudices, etc., (5) by having children present, from their own observation, illustrations of such vices as drunkenness, idleness, and cruelty.

The programme for the intermediate classes (ages nine to eleven) — the heart of the entire course — is more definite. It treats of (1) the child in the family, — duties toward

the parents, grandparents, brothers, sisters, and servants; (2) the child in the school, — docility, assiduity, work, duties toward teacher and fellow-pupils; (3) *la patrie*, — duties toward *la patrie* and society; (4) self-duties toward the body (sobriety, cleanliness, and temperance), duties toward exterior goods (economy, avoidance of debt, work), duties toward the soul (veracity, sincerity, personal dignity, self-respect, modesty); (5) duties toward other men, — justice, charity, kindness, fraternity; (6) duties toward God, — reverence, obedience to God's laws as revealed in conscience and reason.

The superior programme (ages eleven to thirteen) presents a more comprehensive treatment of duties toward the family, society, and *la patrie*.

This programme of moral instruction as a whole is perhaps as comprehensive and rich as can be found anywhere. Moreover, it contains little that is not important for the moral life. It is a careful and complete outline of moral duties.

It should be noted, however, that it is an outline of moral duties rather than a course of study suited to children of public-school age. The men who arranged the programme seem to have been thinking of moral citizens, not of moral children at each stage of their development. It is as if, knowing from their own experience and observation what qualities are desirable in adults, they had said, "Go to; let us arrange a programme in moral instruction which emphasizes all these qualities, and, when our children are grown, we shall have noble citizens." Whether the thing to be taught is related to the life of the child is of little consequence, so long as it is likely to be important to the man.

Again, there is lack of harmony between the most fundamental parts of this course of study — those dealing with duties to self — and the organization and management of French primary schools. France affords the anomaly of a programme of moral instruction suited to a republic and a school organization adapted to an absolute monarchy. The teacher is expected to instruct his pupils in initiative and self-reliance, but the strongly centralized school system forbids him to exercise either of these admirable qualities himself, and the discipline generally maintained prevents pupils from putting this teaching into practice. Personal dignity and self-respect are to be taught, but neither is possible in any high degree to the teacher, whose duties are so minutely prescribed that the Minister of Education at Paris can tell exactly what is being done at any given instant in every school in France. Both qualities are hostile to the dominant spirit of French life, — militarism.

Most of the text-books on morals follow rather closely the intermediate programme. Their chief differences are in method of presentation. One of the books most widely used — having reached its forty-eighth edition in 1904 — is divided into thirteen chapters. Each chapter consists of a number of moral, hygienic, or business precepts and definitions, a résumé to be committed to memory, a group of references to be read in the supplement and copied, a few subjects for pupils' compositions, and several pages of little stories, apparently written by the author, illustrating the teachings of the chapter. There are also questions at the bottom of the page, numbered to correspond with the duties enumerated on that page. An occasional quotation from the laws of France appears among the precepts.

There can be no doubt that this book serves to fix in the child's mind many statements of moral duties, distinctions, and resolutions. The composition exercises, and especially the abundant illustrative material, must serve to give this memory stock greater permanence and meaning. But the book as a whole has a mechanical, precept, question-and-answer air about it which robs it of vitality. Many of its teachings, for example those concerning marriage, are far beyond children nine to eleven years old; others never will have interest except for those few who engage in particular occupations; many others deal with business success rather than with morality. While some of the illustrative material is valuable, much of it is fanciful, inaccurate, and trivial. No attention appears to have been paid to the stages of child development.

Other text-books, less widely used than the above, have less of the question-and-answer character, and use illustrative material selected from the best literature. Some also introduce proverbs and memory gems. The one thing common to all is an abundance of precepts and definitions. Books of the general type described above appear to be most popular because most mechanical.

But how do teachers actually use the programme and text-books? How are the lessons presented? This, of course, varies greatly with different teachers. M. Pierre, director of the normal school at Saint-Cloud, outlines the method usually followed: "The plan of the lesson is written in advance on the board. The lesson is developed and explained. A résumé is dictated. A selection illustrating the résumé is read. A maxim is given in conclusion." But these are only formal steps, untouched by the personality

of the teacher. Is the teaching perfunctory and mechanical, or is it vital and stimulating?

A large number of primary inspectors' reports quoted by Lichtenberger in 1889 indicate that at that time the great majority of the moral teaching was perfunctory and mechanical. Said one inspector, "The teachers lack capacity and conviction." Said another, "The lessons too much resemble ordinary lessons; they lack the emphasis of conviction and sincerity which belongs to true moral instruction." One inspector made the statement that moral instruction did not exist in the schools under his inspection, and then added significantly that he heard a teacher trying to explain to seven- or eight-year-old girls the distinction between soul and body. According to most reports, however, a few teachers under each inspector were able to give the moral instruction in an efficient manner.

M. Pelisson, writing of the situation in 1900, quotes much more favorably from several inspectors. One says, "Of all the different subjects taught in the schools, *la morale* has, in the past ten years, made more serious progress and given better results than any other." Undoubtedly there has been great improvement since the very unfavorable reports of 1889; but an American professor of education, after a recent careful inspection of French primary schools, characterized their moral instruction as "absolutely wooden."

Turning from direct instruction, let us note a few of the indirect forces which affect character. In France, as in Germany, there is, as far as possible, separation of the sexes in primary schools, the boys being taught by men and the girls by women, about half the teachers being of each sex.

The military influence is also strong in French schools. The entire school system is centralized, officered, and controlled much like a great army, with the Minister of Education as commander in chief. French writers speak of education as a war against ignorance. Official courses of study sent out from the Minister's office fix the work to be accomplished by each teacher. All this, together with the influence of three years' military service required of each citizen, makes school discipline military in character. It makes the teacher a subordinate officer, whose chief business is to carry out the orders received from headquarters. It crushes out originality and initiative in teacher and pupil alike, and forbids development of moral selfhood. It subordinates the interests of the individual child to the perfect working of a great machine. It cultivates obedience to authority, but an obedience that is unreasoned and mechanical.

French teachers are less thoroughly trained than German. Secondary teachers receive no professional training. Most primary teachers have had a three-year normal-school course, but it is less professional in character than is the German, and is preceded by less thorough preparation.

Patriotic mottoes and moral maxims commonly adorn the walls of the primary school. There is also posted in a conspicuous place in each class room a copy of the law forbidding corporal punishment.

Competition and rivalry are greatly encouraged by the awarding of many prizes and medals. On the other hand, self-emulation is stimulated by the use of the *cahier*, an exercise book owned by each pupil, and taken from grade to grade as he advances. In this book the pupil writes an exercise at regular intervals, for the sake of comparison with earlier exercises.

IN ENGLISH SCHOOLS

In England, as in Germany, provision is made for direct moral instruction only in connection with religion. For elementary schools, founded by religious societies but enjoying state aid, now known as "non-provided" schools, it is prescribed (1) that no religious test shall be required of any pupil, (2) that religious instruction shall be given at such an hour that parents who choose to do so may withdraw their children without forfeiting any of the other benefits of the school, and (3) that this instruction shall not be subject to inspection by his majesty's inspectors. In schools founded by the state, now known as "provided" schools, the question of religious instruction is left with the local school authority, with the reservations that it shall not be denominational, and that it may be possible for parents to withdraw their children from it as in case of the non-provided schools.

In accordance with this prescription, and under the stimulus of church influences, almost all provided schools have Scripture lessons. The London Board enacted that "the Bible shall be read, and there shall be given such explanations and such instruction therefrom in the principles of morality and religion as are suited to the capacities of the children." The same board issued annually a syllabus of Bible instruction for the use of its teachers. This arrangement survives the dissolution of the London Board and the transference of its duties to the County Council.

At the present time the provided schools and the non-provided schools enroll almost equal numbers of pupils. The subject-matter of religious teaching is much the same

in both, except that non-provided schools require the catechism, church dogmas, and other denominational features. With this distinction in mind it will suffice to present only the religious teaching of the provided schools. Most that will be said is based on the London plan, which has been widely adopted.

It is almost a universal custom to open the school with a hymn and prayer, either the Lord's Prayer or one or more short prayers from the Book of Common Prayer. The Scripture lessons are given immediately after the opening of the morning session, and occupy about a half hour. "Teachers are instructed to make the lessons as practical as possible, and not to give attention to unnecessary details."

Examinations are held at regular intervals and reviews are frequent. Numerous prizes, provided by private individuals, are distributed annually among those pupils making the best showing in the examinations.

All lessons are based on the syllabus furnished by the local educational authority. The syllabus provides a different programme for each of the seven standards or classes, but each standard reviews much that has been learned in the earlier standards. The Lord's Prayer, the Ten Commandments, Proverbs, many of the Psalms, and selections from the Gospels and the Prophets are committed to memory. The child is made familiar with the lives of Old-Testament heroes, "with the practical lessons therefrom, together with the teaching of the law of Moses with reference to the poor, the stranger, the fatherless, the widow, parents, and children." The life and teachings of Christ are studied with care, special attention being given to the parables of the sower, the lost sheep, the laborers in the

vineyard, the talents, the good Samaritan, the lost piece of money, the prodigal son, the Pharisee and the publican. The learning of texts illustrating the duties of truthfulness and temperance is emphasized.

It is obvious that the syllabus was arranged with special emphasis on the moral teachings of the Bible. Nearly all of the most objectionable part of the religious instruction of the German schools is omitted. It is also arranged with considerable regard for the age of the child, the simpler stories and easier selections coming first.

As to the manner in which these Scripture lessons are taught, it may be said (1) that a reverent spirit is generally manifest in both teacher and pupils, and (2) that the Scripture lessons are taught with as great care and thoroughness as any other lessons. The instruction appears to be less devotional in provided than in non-provided schools, and more thorough as far as historical facts of the Bible are concerned. This is the natural result of the fact that teachers in the former are better trained than those in the latter.

An official report of inspection of religious teaching in provided schools states that "the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man are the keynotes of it. So far as examination can test it, the upshot of the lessons may be said to be the acquisition of a very fair knowledge of the Bible story, and the committal to memory, and perhaps to heart, of a considerable amount of the Bible text."

Prominent among the indirect influences for moral training in English schools, as in all schools, is the teacher's preparation. Teachers in secondary schools are almost entirely without professional training. Of elementary teachers

only about twenty-five per cent have had a two-year normal-school course, — which is more largely secondary than professional. Almost as large a per cent are pupil teachers, — young apprentices of from fifteen to eighteen years of age. England ranks with America rather than with Germany or France in teacher training.

The predominance of female teachers is also a marked feature of English elementary schools, less than twenty-five per cent being men, according to the census of 1902.

The organization and management of English schools are comparatively free from the influence of militarism and the extreme centralization so noticeable on the continent. The teacher enjoys a good degree of freedom, and is able to arrange his work with some reference to his individuality and the needs of the local community. He is more a partner, and less a servant, of the government in its educational work than is the French or German teacher. A school atmosphere is thus created which stimulates a feeling of responsibility and initiative in the pupils. Punishments are sometimes severe, but order and obedience are not of a military, mechanical character. The relations between teacher and pupil are more intimate than on the continent, though less so than in America.

Games, play, and athletic contests occupy a prominent place in the lives of English school children. The spirit of the Eton playing fields is invading the elementary schools. Teachers generally are in sympathy with school games, and frequently take part, believing that "a vigorous use of the play hours is of primal importance in developing manhood." "Germans who visit English schools have often said they would like to transfer to German schools

the force and enthusiasm of the English student in out-of-door sports, his self-reliance, and the relations of the teachers and pupils."

Many teachers in cities and towns where there are library facilities seek to direct the home reading of their pupils along lines that are helpful to character.

Turning our attention to the secondary schools, we find that Eton, Rugby, Harrow, Winchester, and similar institutions have most fully recognized the culture value of games. Outdoor sports are graded and made a regular part of the curriculum. Boys are excused from them only on medical advice. Any absence from the field is treated as an absence from the class room. Masters not only direct the games but often join in them. On the average, nearly two hours each afternoon are devoted to sports.

Mr. Paton, high master of Manchester Grammar School, after discussing the physical advantages of these public-school games, speaks of their moral value as follows:

> But there are other effects, less obvious and less conscious, but more important and quite as real. Indirectly, but none the less effectively, games develop promptness of action and promptness of decision, prompt command on the part of the captain, prompt obedience on the part of the team. They teach self-restraint, how to keep one's temper under trying circumstances, and respect for an adversary even in the hottest conflict. They teach straightforwardness and a sense of honor, rudimentary but real. They teach unselfishness, and what English people specially lack, — the habit of coöperating with each other. And they teach all this in the line of the boy's own natural taste and natural activities. His native combativeness, which if neglected would make him a hooligan, and if repressed makes him a coward, is thus utilized to make him a man.

The curriculum of most English secondary schools is extremely classical, cultivating conservatism, respect for

authority, imitation of the ancient, — in a word the spirit of scholasticism. The "public school" devotes twice as much time to Greek and Latin as does the German gymnasium or the French lycée. Science — which stands for individual observation, independence, self-reliance, self-expression — has hardly begun to find a place. The classical influence is, however, offset by that of the playing field.

A limited degree of coöperative discipline prevails, placing considerable responsibility for good order on "sixth-form" boys and granting them special privileges in return.

Cramming for university, professional, joint board, and other examinations is a distinctive feature of the secondary school. Each school is judged by the success of its candidates in competitive examinations; therefore every boy who shows special ability is crammed to the limit of his capacity, at the expense of his fellow-students and of his own highest interests. A member of the Moseley Commission speaks of the cramming system as one of the most serious difficulties which English secondary schools have to face.

We have now reviewed briefly the principal forces which make for character in the school systems of four great nations.

We have found in America teachers, on the whole, poorly trained, three fourths of them women, giving moral instruction only incidentally and relying chiefly on the indirect means of school life for moral training. We have found in Germany the best-trained body of teachers in the world, nearly all men, giving dogmatic religious instruction of the type common three centuries ago, and managing their schools with almost military exactness and rigor. We have

found in France teachers second in training only to those of Germany, about equally divided as to sex, giving moral lessons prescribed and carefully outlined by the state, and conducting their schools largely in accordance with the directions of the Minister of Education at Paris. We have found in England teachers trained, and divided as to sex, much the same as in America, giving in half the elementary schools sectarian and in half non-sectarian religious instruction, enjoying a considerable degree of freedom in the management of their schools, and relying to some extent on indirect means for moral training.

Here is diversity indeed. In all this diversity, however, a few things have stood out clearly, compelling attention.

The personality of the teacher has forced itself persistently to the front throughout this study as the ultimate source of power in the school. This force alone gives vitality to the sectarian religious teaching of the German school, and to the non-religious moral instruction of the French school. The same force puts life into the English non-sectarian Scripture lessons, and into the incidental moral and religious teachings of the American school.

The personality of the teacher is also the vital factor in most of the indirect moral influences of the school. Much emphasis is often placed on the moral value of school subjects, especially history, literature, nature study, manual training, and the like, and there can be no question that these are rich in moral-culture material; but their significance for character depends chiefly on the teacher. We hear it said sometimes that the public opinion of the pupils has far more influence on character than anything the teacher may say. The statement contains a profound

truth; public opinion, in the school or out of it, has immense weight in determining the ideals and conduct of the individual. But public opinion in the school is, or ought to be, in great measure, the teacher's opinion — the expression of his personality — crystallized in the minds of his pupils. We hear much of the importance of the moral atmosphere of the school, and this is tremendously important. The child should literally breathe a moral atmosphere at home and at school if he is to attain the best moral character. It may be added that he must not be more conscious of this atmosphere than he is of the natural atmosphere which carries life-giving oxygen to every fiber of his body. But the moral atmosphere of the school is essentially its routine and discipline permeated by the teacher's personality.

If one ask why the personality of the teacher is the vital factor in the moral training of the school, we can do no better than answer in the words of Professor Coe, and in the spirit of Pestalozzi, "The essential method of education is the sharing of life."

The practical bearing of this is seen in the training, selection, and retention of teachers. Concerning their training more will be said later. As to the selection and retention of teachers, it must be confessed that if only ideal teachers were employed most of our schools would be teacherless. On the other hand, it is one of the saddest facts of educational management that the moral personality of a candidate for an educational position frequently counts for less than the amount of influence which he is able to bring to bear on the board. Moreover, it is often the case that teachers, principals, or superintendents are

retained long after it is known that their moral influence over their pupils is bad. A prominent American educational writer has well said, "School boards that fail to inquire minutely into the past conduct, character, and moral reputation of a candidate for an educational position — superintendent, principal, or teacher — are guilty of criminal neglect." He might have added that they are far more guilty when they retain a teacher whose moral influence has become persistently bad.

Our study also serves to show that the genetic point of view is fundamental in efficient moral training. Attention must be given to the different stages of child development.

The religious instruction of the German schools and the moral instruction of the French schools were planned with adult life in view, not to meet the needs and conditions of child life. True, in the German Bible stories, in many of the French text-book lessons on morals, in much of the English and American incidental teaching of morals and religion, simple language is used in order that the ideas conveyed may be grasped by the child mind; but it is not considered whether these ideas are suited to the child's stage of moral development. The rigorous discipline of the military type, less common in America than in any of the other countries but still far from extinct here, is based on the theological conception of total depravity instead of on a scientific study of the child's moral nature.

The genetic point of view is significant for moral training, in the first place, because it seeks to relate all of the regular work of the school to the life of the child. It seeks to determine the spontaneous interests at each stage of child development and to correlate school work with these

interests. The recent overhauling of school curricula, with extensive revision and enrichment, is a step in this direction.

But the genetic point of view is significant for moral training in more direct ways. It brings out with greater clearness the importance of suggestion and imitation in child training, revealing the variations of these to be adopted with advancing age. It shows that every pupil is constantly learning by suggestion, whether the teacher would have it so or not. It intensifies and gives a scientific basis to the emphasis placed on individual differences in children, — differences in physical health, which often mean much for the intellectual and moral life; initial differences in temperament, emotional range, mental and moral initiative, sympathy, tact, etc.; differences in home training before entering school, and in the entire out-of-school environment. It shows that the child's standards of morality differ from those of the adult. It furnishes information concerning the development of the moral nature, — sense of law, sense of truth, attitude toward authority, conscience, selfishness, self-sacrifice, moral ideals, etc. To be sure, comparatively little has yet been done in the study of the moral development of the child, but this little suffices, notwithstanding individual differences, to show that the field is rich in suggestions for moral training.

It is not enough, however, that the teacher should profit by the results of others inspired by this point of view. The most important advantage of the genetic point of view is its effect upon the teacher himself, once he really gets it. He looks upon the same school equipment, the same daily routine, the same boys and girls as before, but his attitude toward them is as different as was the astronomer's attitude

toward the heavens when he passed from the geocentric to the heliocentric conception of the solar system. No longer ability to pass examinations, nor discipline, nor athletic standing, but the child himself is the central object of the school. The full meaning of the obvious principle, "The child is not made for the school but the school for the child," is recognized.

Again, our study emphasizes the immense number of means available for moral training.

The advocate of a particular means, such as direct moral instruction, usually overlooks or underestimates the many other forces of the school which make for character. This was a fault of the framers of the French course of study. Judging by their statements, they expected moral instruction to be the panacea for the moral ills of French life. But the differences in individual children, and in the same children at different times, make necessary many ways of approach, and demand that all be kept open.

The organization of the school throws open to the alert teacher a great number and variety of such ways of approach. Moral instruction — including the use of proverbs, mottoes, injunctions, exhortations, and precepts — has a place in the school, and perhaps no school is entirely without it. But it does not follow that such instruction should be given at stated times as fixed lessons, and least of all from text-books. A brief word now and then called out by some incident of school life and earnestly uttered is worth more than a score of ordinary text-book lessons. Moral instruction has value according to its opportuneness and the tact, sincerity, and moral earnestness of the teacher. It must be sympathetic, individual, related to

experience, and based on an intimate knowledge of the one instructed. "The inculcation of moral rules," says Professor Dewey, "is no more likely to make character than is that of astronomical formulæ." Professor Roark tells of a high-school boy who, on being expelled from school, exclaimed, "I got fired, but I got 98 per cent in ethics."

In the lower grades, stories and fables, in the higher, reading lessons, history, and literature, furnish rich stores for cultivating the moral judgment and for fostering high ideals. But the teacher must, for the most part, allow the moral of the lesson to find its own way into the lives of his pupils. He may, however, see to it, particularly in the lower grades, that it is suited to his pupils' needs, just as a gardener surrounds the roots of a plant with soil rich in those elements which the plant can incorporate into its life.

Among other school subjects, manual training, nature study, and school gardens are most important for moral training. An eminent educator has said: "The chief value of nature study in character building is that, like life itself, it deals with realities. Nature study, if it be genuine, is essentially doing. This is the basis of its effectiveness as a moral agent." The same may be said of manual training and of school gardening. All three of these subjects serve to furnish the pupil with pleasant occupation for leisure moments out of school, and thus to remove him from the bane of idleness. They teach respect for property rights. A lad of fourteen, in the Lyman School for delinquent boys on the charge of theft, said to the principal one day: "Mr. P——, I 've learned not to steal. Some fellow stole my finest muskmelons, and I know now how it feels." Patience is inculcated by these studies, since the

pupil must wait for results till his labor, or that of nature, is completed. In so far as they contribute to muscle and nerve, they help to build the foundation of positive moral character. It is noteworthy that experience has shown manual training and gardening to be two of the most potent forces for reclaiming delinquent boys.

We have seen that games and play may be very important factors in developing self-control, initiative, coöperation, respect for the rights of others, loyalty to the social group. They are also of great value to the observing teacher in revealing the characters, temperaments, and dispositions of his pupils.

It has already been intimated that physical training is significant for character. Herbart said long ago: "Sickly natures feel themselves dependent; robust ones dare to *will*. Therefore the care of health is essentially a part of the formation of character." Evolutionally the development of the human muscular system leads that of the intellectual and moral life. Recent studies, notable among them Mr. Puffer's study of the physical, social, intellectual, and moral qualities of a hundred delinquent boys, show a close relation between perfect physical development and positive morality. In boys' camps and summer schools this is recognized. Dr. Talbot, at his boys' camp at Lake Asquam, New Hampshire, produces almost marvelous improvement in the mental and moral lives of stupid, backward boys by simply giving them an abundance of sleep and outdoor exercise. Physical training suited to the needs of the individual pupil will some day be generally recognized as one of the first essentials to character building.

Even the arrangements of the building as to light, heat, ventilation, and sanitation contribute to or detract from the general orderliness of the school. Every teacher knows that many a case of discipline, with far-reaching consequences, has arisen from poor ventilation, and many another from narrow halls.

Discipline and management are immensely rich in possibilities for character building. The aim, however, must not be merely good order and absence of friction, but the development of moral selfhood through coöperation. "Breaking the will" has no place in the school. Military discipline may "hold down" even vigorous, healthy boys, but it utterly fails to build up character. The child should early be made to feel a copartnership in and a responsibility for the government of the school. This is done admirably in a well-managed "school city," and may also be done equally well without such elaborate machinery.

Self-emulation, encouraged by comparison of the pupil's work of one month or year with his own work of an earlier date, such as is possible in French schools by means of the *cahier*, may well supersede much of the vicious competition promoted by examinations and prizes. Colonel Parker never tired of condemning "the systematic cultivation of selfishness by bribery, — per cents, material rewards, and prizes."

The routine of a well-managed school, as Dr. Harris has so ably pointed out, cultivates habits of punctuality, regularity, and system, — marks of character often too little recognized.

Pupil organizations, such as clubs, Legions of Honor, and the like in the upper grades, and in the high schools literary and debating societies, athletic associations, fraternities,

and musical clubs, — particularly if spontaneous organizations, — are important moral factors in the school life.

Even the school janitor is a moral factor of no little consequence; his character and reputation, his attitude toward the pupils, as well as the thoroughness with which he does his work, are legitimate and necessary subjects of inquiry on the part of the board employing him.

It is vital that there be such an assignment of school work that every pupil, not merely the brightest, nor yet all but the dullest, but *all*, may be conscious of progress, may feel the satisfaction, the power, and the will for further effort which come only from doing, from overcoming obstacles. It is the glory of manual training and nature study that they consist essentially in doing. They furnish to many a pupil who would otherwise seldom experience it, the consciousness of progress.

Enough has been said to indicate the great number and variety of means afforded by the school for moral training, though the catalogue is by no means complete. It needs to be added that all forces must harmonize, must work together, not only for character, but for the same kind of character, — and that, democratic manhood, — if the best results are to be realized. It has been seen that a chief fault of French moral education is that the organization and management of the school repress the type of character which instruction seeks to develop. Many an American teacher encourages moral selfhood by every means save the essential one, — giving his pupils an opportunity to practice it. Many another urges his pupils to honesty and truthfulness, and then encourages their opposites by watching for them.

Our study leads also to the conclusion that the school can do much more for the moral training of its pupils in their out-of-school lives. "The end of the school is its effects upon the home," writes a Swedish educator. Henderson says, "The pedagogy of the future will concern itself far more with the child out of school than with the child in the school."

Sociologists lament the decline of the home, owing to changing industrial and economic conditions. It is unquestionably true that the average home occupies a far less prominent place in the life of the child to-day than it did a generation ago. The social environment has become a more powerful factor. The home, whether wisely or not, has delegated a larger share of its responsibility to the school. The school has been obliged to concern itself more and more with the health, the nourishment, the environment, and the activities of its pupils during the many hours of the day when it does not have direct supervision over them.

The means for making the school more effective in the home lives of its pupils are chiefly two. One of these is mothers' meetings. These are held in the schools of many of our cities. They are specially valuable in the poor and foreign sections, since they bring the school and home into mutual sympathy, teach the mothers how to care for the physical and moral needs of their children, and implant in the homes some of the school's ideals.

The second and by all odds the most important means of influencing the out-of-school lives of pupils is the sheer momentum of school activity. The school can, and frequently does, start in its brief five hours of the day activities

possessing such inherent force that they *must* work themselves out in the child's leisure and recreation. Only such activities as appeal strongly to the pupil and connect readily with home interests can ever acquire this momentum. Manual training, nature study, and school gardens possess these qualities in a marked degree, though the opportunities for their practical application in and around the home are often pitiably meager. Only a few days ago a little fellow accosted me on the street with, "Say, mister, do you know birds?" He then gave a description of a new bird he had just seen, and wanted to know its name. Nature study had given that boy something to think about when out of school.

Games, also, may be taught, as they are in some of the schools of New York City, expressly for the purpose of providing the children with suitable recreation when away from the school. Teachers in the higher grades are beginning to make serious efforts to influence the home reading of their pupils and to give them permanent interests in good reading. Rapid increase in public-library facilities has made this an important, though extremely difficult, problem. A grammar-school principal told me recently that, after several years of carefully directed efforts by herself and her teachers to influence the home reading of her pupils, she found by actual investigation that almost nothing had been accomplished.

Finally, this study forces one to the conclusion that special preparation of teachers for their work of moral training in the school is the first and chief prerequisite of increased efficiency. "School reform is always schoolmaster reform."

When all has been said, the fact remains that the moral training of the school to-day is haphazard, unsystematic, unscientific. Part of it is directed in a chaotic sort of way by the teacher, whose methods are chiefly the result of accident. The greater part is left to chance; it may be good, it may be bad; it may be in harmony with that directed by the teacher, and it may not. And yet practically all educators are agreed that the fundamental aim of education is character.

Teachers' training schools are doing little to improve the situation. True, the German teacher is specially trained for his religious teaching; it is true also that the French teacher devotes considerable time in the normal school to preparation for teaching *la morale;* and many, though by no means a majority of English teachers are prepared to some extent for teaching Scripture lessons. Moreover, nearly all of the teachers of Germany and France, and an increasing percentage of those of England and America, have a general pedagogical training. These facts must not be overlooked. It has already been pointed out how general pedagogical training of teachers is related to the moral influences of the school. Few will question that any country does wisely in demanding special training in religion and morals of the teachers of these subjects.

However, neither general professional training as it is given to-day, nor such special training as that given by the German, French, or English normal schools, is sufficient. The former gives almost no attention to moral training, either direct or indirect. The latter concerns itself only with direct instruction, and seeks to give a comprehensive knowledge of what is to be taught rather than of the best

methods of teaching it. Either separately or together they fail to give a teacher anything like adequate preparation for the great task of moral training in the school.

But how shall such preparation be given, and what shall be its nature? It should be given in every normal school as a separate subject, and by an expert. It should also be made a regular part of the work of teachers' institutes, and of the training given to teachers already employed in city systems. It should become the heart of all professional training of teachers.

The direction which special preparation of teachers for moral training should take has been intimated in the preceding paragraphs. Much attention should be given to the place of the teacher's personality. Child study should be pursued with special reference to the development of spontaneous interests and of the moral nature, and also to individual differences. The teacher must acquire the genetic point of view which recognizes the child as the center of the school's life and effort. He should be led to appreciate the physiological basis of character. He should consider the place of the school in moral training, in relation to the home, the church, and the social environment of out-of-school life, — this in order that in actual teaching he may be led to study the moral environment of his school and of his individual pupils. He should be made familiar with the great variety of means which the ordinary school affords for moral training, both within the school and outside of it, giving attention to the possible contribution of each and to their relative values. He should be led to recognize the necessity of harmonizing all of the moral forces at work in the school. Special methods of moral

training made use of in particular schools such as Abbotsholme, the Ethical Culture School of New York City, the Elmira Reformatory, etc., should be studied carefully. The practice school should be utilized for illustrative and experimental purposes. All this should be additional to a general pedagogical training, or better, should be an essential part of it.

Thus equipped, the teacher in his class room and the principal in his building — each having been selected only after his personal character has been carefully investigated — should be given absolute freedom to work out his own method of moral training and his own plan of organization and management. Both may be given suggestions by higher authority, but neither should be required to maintain a certain kind of discipline or organization, or to teach a given course, or in fact any course, in religion or morals. Nor should they be forbidden to teach either, so long as they avoid offense to the consciences and religious beliefs of pupils and parents. Moral personality is the most precious possession of any teacher; let him share it with his pupils in whatever way he finds best, so long as he offends none.

Such is the plan proposed on the basis of this comparative study for making moral training in our public schools more efficient. It will not make the school a perfect institution for moral training — the millennium is not yet due. It probably will not implant, though it will intensify, moral earnestness in the teacher. But it will give unity, definiteness, and system to the teacher's most important work, — a work now left largely to chance. It will tend to do for

moral training what modern pedagogy is trying to do too exclusively for physical and intellectual training, — give it a scientific basis.

George E. Myers

Principal McKinley Manual
Training High School
Washington, D.C.

AUG 27 1907

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS
0 029 467 972 8